

The Classical Review

NOVEMBER 1887.

GEORG CURTIUS.

Georg Curtius. Ein Charakteristik von E. WINDISCH. Berlin. Calvary and Co. 1887. pp. 56. Mk. 2.40.

THE short pamphlet by Professor Windisch is a welcome addition to the memorials of his revered master. Dr. Angermann in the tenth volume of Bezzenberger's *Beiträge* has given an interesting sketch of the life and the personal influence of Georg Curtius. His elder brother, Professor Ernst Curtius, has prefixed to the first volume of the *Kleine Schriften* of the deceased scholar a charming picture of him as he appeared to one of the comparatively few who were honoured with a close and affectionate intimacy. But there was still room, and indeed there was a real demand, for an account of his scientific work, from a sympathetic but not a partisan's standpoint; and this has been well given us by Dr. Windisch. There was a demand for this, because unquestionably the tendency of the most advanced school in comparative philology has been to lay undue stress upon those parts of the work of Curtius which may now appear to be antiquated, to bring into prominence points of difference rather than those of agreement, and to ignore or pass over lightly contributions to the development of the science which were of real value. From these faults the memorial sketch by Dr. Windisch is entirely free. He does not disguise the extent to which he differs from some of Curtius's conclusions. He does not deny the value of some of the more recent theories, to which Curtius never gave his assent. But he brings out clearly the full significance of his work and his personal influence as a whole; and rightly lays stress upon it as an essential factor in the history of his favourite science.

The most important service that Curtius rendered was one which no man could have done who was not, as he was from the be-

ginning to the end of his career, in the first place a classical scholar. Schleicher, with all his wide linguistic attainments, was not this even in the second place. He was at heart a Darwinian botanist, who handled language as if it were the subject-matter of natural and not of historical science. His services are not to be underrated, obsolete as are many of his results. But it could never have been said of him, as Dr. Windisch well says of Curtius, that he first brought two great sciences into a mutually helpful relation to one another. Curtius was not a student of language, availing himself of the aid of Latin and Greek to attack the general questions of linguistics, but a classical scholar, studying the languages of Greece and Rome in the light of comparative philology. It was very significant that his first important work was dedicated (1846) to Lassen and Ritschl. In the earlier part of his career, his lectures extended over a wide field of Greek and Latin literature. To the last he retained his interest in the literary as well as the purely grammatical study of the ancient authors. Hence few men were better fitted to maintain the connexion between the two sides of philology, which cannot be parted without serious loss to both. He never appeared as leading an irruption of comparative philology into the territory of scholarship, but rather as welcoming its aid in a field to which much of his own labour was devoted. He was always proud to be a classical scholar, and whatever he could learn from the comparison of other languages was always brought to bear upon the explanation of the structure of those with which he was immediately concerned. Sometimes he was taunted with not having a wide enough command of languages for a comparative philologist; but for the work which he had to do, a thorough knowledge of the classical tongues, combined with the power to follow adequately what others

were doing in cognate languages, was what was most necessary, and this never failed him.

Dr. Windisch shows well how it was the instinct, or call it, if you please, the prejudice of a classical scholar, which made him cling to the notion of a Graeco-Italic unity, after the scientific basis of this theory was really destroyed.

Not that Curtius was without a keen sense of the mysterious nature and vitality of language, and of the fascination of the more abstract problems which it presents. But he never lost himself in details, and hence, while he contributed less than some of his contemporaries by special investigations, no one was better fitted to survey the general progress of his science, and to sum up its total gains at any particular time. This is what gives to his *Grundzüge* the character which, as Dr. Windisch justly says, even his opponents allow to it, that of one of the most valuable and useful works on the science of language. The successive editions of it showed how ready he was to learn as well as to teach; and a comparison of the eleventh section of his Introduction in the first and in the fifth edition gives a vivid conception of the progress of the science during the years which separated them.

Dr. Windisch rightly regards the year 1873, in which the second edition of Curtius's *Zur Chronologie*, and the first volume of *Das Verbum der Griechischen Sprache* appeared, as the last in which the clear majority of competent scholars was decidedly on the side of Bopp and his school, the last in which Curtius could hold his favourite position as the representative of a general *consensus*. When, four years later, a second edition of the latter work appeared, it was already, though far too harshly, pronounced to be antiquated. In a sense it will never be antiquated. It sums up in a final form the results of a certain method, which long held sway in philology, and it marks the utmost progress attained along certain lines. To advance further, the problem had to be attacked in an entirely different fashion; and for this the materials collected by Curtius gave the most valuable help. But both as a writer and as a teacher he reached at this time his zenith. His pupils were even more numerous than those of his illustrious colleague Ritschl, and in the winter of 1874 his lectures on Greek Grammar were attended by 273 students. This date happens to mark the completion of his twenty-fifth year as a professor; when the foundation of the *Curtius-Stiftung* by contributions from all parts of the civilized world showed the honour in which he was held.

From that year a certain decline in his personal and scientific influence may be dated. In 1868 Scherer in his *Zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache* had protested against the undue limitation of philology to the merely mechanical aspect of phonetic changes, and had called for more attention to the psychical processes underlying the development of languages. At the same time, and in close connexion with this, he had urged that the only safe basis for the theoretical reconstruction of the earlier forms of speech was the careful study of the forces at work in the periods more directly and intimately known to us. His protests told more immediately upon the method of Schleicher than on that of Curtius; but the two scholars belonged essentially to the same school, and the teaching of the latter did not pass unchallenged. The view e.g. that the Sanskrit *bhārāmi* was the representative of a primitive *bharāmi*, from which *φέρω*, *fero*, &c., were derived, was directly denied by Scherer. He maintained that the primitive form was *bharā*, and that *bhārāmi* was a later form due to the analogy of verbs like *dādāmi*. The operation of analogy was universally admitted in modern languages. He insisted that it should be no less fully recognised as at work in the ancient languages, even in comparatively early stages. Of the younger scholars it was Leskien in Leipzig who took up most warmly the views of Scherer, and urged them, both in lectures and in private conversation, on those of his own generation. So was formed by degrees the school of the 'young grammarians.' Their cardinal principles were (1) that phonetic laws, so far as they act mechanically, admit of no exceptions; (2) that the 'association of forms' in all stages of the history of a language has led to changes due to a false analogy. Both these principles were applied with a rigour and consistency which led to very different results from those which had been generally accepted. Curtius, for example, had endeavoured to bring as many as possible of the letter-changes in Greek under the heading of regular laws. But he had devoted quite half of his *Grundzüge* to the discussion of what he called 'sporadic' or 'irregular' letter changes. The very existence of such sporadic changes, except so far as they were dialectic, was now denied. 'Analogy' was pressed into the service, to account for all phenomena which did not agree with regular laws. The boldness and consistency with which Curtius's younger colleague Brugmann applied these principles in a famous article on the *Nasalis sonans*, published in the ninth volume of Curtius's

Studien, showed clearly how far the new school was ready to push its dissent from currently received conclusions, and made it impossible for that series of studies to be continued as a joint publication. In 1878 and the following years Brugmann and Osthoff published four volumes of *Morphologische Untersuchungen*, in which various problems of etymology and inflexion were attacked with remarkable learning and ingenuity. The views of the new school were really only an expansion and a natural outcome of the principles for which Curtius had long been contending. But it was only natural that he should be slow to accept the far-reaching modifications of his explanation of many details which they seemed to entail. It was not less natural that his caution and sobriety should appear timorous to many who were fascinated by the boldness of the younger philologists, and that his teaching should seem to be antiquated. His attitude in face of the new doctrines was thoroughly dignified, and worthy of his high position. No element of personal bitterness, no jealousy or irritability, for which his severe physical sufferings at this time might have served as some excuse, was ever allowed to interfere with his calm consideration of his young opponents' theories. Wherever he was able to recognise any well-established contribution to science, he accepted it gladly, and the fifth edition of his *Grundzüge* (reproduced in the second edition of the English translation) showed how ready he was to incorporate all changes which convinced his judgment. For nine years he contented himself with watching the development of the new doctrines, and occasionally uttering a warning against premature or extravagant conclusions, which their champions seemed to be advancing. At last in 1885 he published his *Zur Kritik der neuesten Sprachforschung*, in which he attempted a more systematic and complete criticism of the newer philology as a whole. It cannot be denied that in this brief, but most pregnant, treatise, he hit not a few weak points in the doctrines now rapidly becoming popular. But the work was essentially one of reconciliation. It had been common to speak of the new views as amounting to a 'catastrophe' in the history of comparative philology. Curtius showed that after all the movement in advance—and he did not deny for a moment that it was in advance—was proceeding along lines which had been laid down by the founders of the science, and that the appearance of discord had arisen, at least in part, from an undue stress

upon the physical aspect of language, and a neglect of its historical development. On the other hand it must be admitted that Curtius hardly realised the full force of the arguments in support of the new views, and Brugmann's rejoinder, appended to his inaugural address as Professor of Comparative Philology at Freiburg, was a masterly and conclusive defence of the positions taken up by the school of which he is now one of the foremost representatives. Not only on the general questions of the action of phonetic laws, and of the far-reaching influence of analogy, did he show that his views were a legitimate and consistent development of principles which Curtius himself had admitted; but also with regard to the varied vocalisation of the primitive Indo-Germanic stock, and the untrustworthy character of much of the analysis of inflexions commonly taught, he gained an unquestioned victory. A teacher who now contents himself with reproducing the doctrines of Schleicher and Curtius, as they were all but universally accepted ten years back, ought to be aware that he has been left far behind by the progress of his science, and that much of his teaching will consist of baseless theories and exploded speculations, while even what is correct will be lacking in the unity of a rigorous and accurate method.

But admitting this to the full, the place of Curtius is none the less assured in the history of comparative philology. For thirty years he stood in the very forefront of those who were leading the advance. His original contributions were not numerous, and some of those which appeared at the time the most valuable have been set aside by more recent researches. But no one of his contemporaries was guided in his inquiries by a finer instinct; no one had a fuller knowledge of the work that was being done in the philological field, or examined its results with a more sober and vigilant criticism, or gathered them into a more attractive and intelligible form; no one finally had a deeper influence on the pupils that gathered in such numbers around him, or inspired them with a purer delight in that pursuit of truth to which his own blameless and exemplary life was devoted. It will be long before the scientific value of his works shall be exhausted; but when, in the progress of the study, for which he did so much, that day arrives, they will still retain their interest as marking an important stage in its development, and as models of sound learning, clear statement, and judicial sobriety.

A. S. WILKINS.

T 2

SCHILLER'S HISTORY OF THE EMPIRE.

Geschichte der Römischen Kaiserzeit. By Prof. SCHILLER. Band II. Gotha. 1887. 9 Mk.

No one who reads Prof. Schiller's history will be inclined to underestimate either his learning, or the amount of conscientious study which he has devoted to his subject. But he has no mercy on his readers, and we fear that for all but the strongest digestions this volume, like that which preceded it, will prove too tough a morsel. The truth is that he has produced not so much a history, as a collection of the materials for a history. The value of his work lies in the mass of facts which he has brought together and in the fulness of his references, alike to the ancient authorities and to the modern literature, while it is in the selection and grouping of his facts that he fails. Too often we cannot see the wood for the trees, and the general outlines and distinctive features of the period are constantly obscured by the mass of details. These defects are the more unfortunate because the period with which this volume deals, that from Diocletian to Theodosius, is at once one of the most important, and the most difficult of comprehension in ancient history. It moreover stands in great need of a historian. Tillemont, laborious and learned as he was, worked with inadequate materials, and with a very imperfect grasp of the chief problems of the time, while Gibbon's treatment of this period is on the whole the least satisfactory part of his great work. Since Gibbon wrote, although much has been done in special departments—and notably in all that concerns the movements of the barbarian peoples—there has been, if we except the necessarily brief sketch in Ranke's *Weltgeschichte*, and the rather superficial account given by Duruy, no serious attempt made at a history of the time as a whole, and this want Prof. Schiller has only partially supplied.

The volume opens, rightly enough, with a section on the authorities—which in itself affords a good illustration of Prof. Schiller's strong and weak points. As a catalogue it leaves little to be desired, but its value for the student would have been trebled, had the list of names been supplemented by something more in the way of a critical estimate of the importance and relation to each other of the different writers; we should also have welcomed, what Prof.

Schiller is undoubtedly competent to give, some account of the mass of evidence from inscriptions, coins and monuments which recent research has accumulated, and of its general bearing on the literary tradition.

Roughly speaking, it may be said that the three points on which the attention of the historian should be fastened during this period are, first, the development and working of the elaborate administrative machinery, by means of which Diocletian and his successors hoped to compensate for the decay of internal strength and spontaneous energy; secondly, the growth of the Christian Church and its relations with the imperial government on the one hand, and the barbarians on the other; thirdly, the movements of the barbarian peoples themselves. To the first of these Prof. Schiller devotes about a hundred pages, closely packed with solid matter, and it is here perhaps that his want of constructive skill will be most keenly felt. Emperor and senate, the civil and financial administration, the court and the army are all separately dealt with, their functions and position stated, but though we are shown in turn each part of the machinery, we get no clear impression of its actual working and effects. Thus the section on the civil administration (pp. 44–68) would have been all the better for the omission of some of the less important details as to the duties of the various officials, and the insertion of a few of those graphic illustrations from the actual history which are necessary to give life and meaning to the most careful analysis. Apart from this excessively anatomical treatment and an occasional want of sequence in the arrangement (e.g. the account of the mode of succession to the imperial purple, and of the system of joint rule, is interposed between the paragraphs dealing with the names borne by the emperors and those dealing with their titles), there is little in this part of the book to call for special criticism in a brief review like the present. A few points however may be noticed. Prof. Schiller leaves us in some doubt as to his view of the 'nomina' borne by Diocletian and Maximian. We do not quite understand whether he thinks that Diocletian assumed both Aurelius and Valerius on his accession, or whether he considers that 'Valerius,' as is just possible, previously belonged to him. As regards Maximian, he was surely 'ein

Aurelii' only because, as Prof. Schiller elsewhere implies, he assumed or was granted the two names 'Aurelius Valerius' on being associated with Diocletian in the government. The Oriental pomp with which the emperors of this period surrounded themselves is rightly traced further back than Diocletian, but the statement that its introduction was due to the 'Verlegung des Schwerpunktes des Römerreichs nach Osten' (pp. 33, 34) is hardly adequate as an explanation. Prof. Schiller comes nearer to one at least of the reasons for this, when on p. 122, note 1, he calls attention to the direct imitation of Sassanid practice by Diocletian. In other words this orientalising tendency, for which strange to say two such vigorous and soldierlike emperors as Aurelian and Diocletian are mainly responsible, was the result partly of a desire to surround the Roman emperor with as much visible majesty as his only rivals in the East, the Sassanid kings; partly of a hope that, if thus fenced round by ceremonial and dignified by outward splendour, he might be rendered less accessible to attack from his own subjects. It was, in fact, like the practice of adoption, one of several methods intended to remedy the two weakest points in the imperial system, the want of a legitimate origin, and of an established order of succession. The section on the civil administration, though cast in too statistical a form, is accurate and fairly complete. The author correctly points out that this later administrative system is distinguished from the earlier by its exact division of labour, and the substitution for the old type of magistrates with their ill-defined prerogatives and conflicting jurisdiction of the 'Berufsbeamte' und 'Berufsoffizier' (p. 44). He does not, however, call attention to the fact that this newer type of official is from the first characteristic of the imperial service, as distinct from that of the state, and that its gradual spread marks the progressive extension of that service over the whole area of the empire to the exclusion of the other. In the section on finance, we cannot help regretting that Prof. Schiller has not given a fuller and clearer account of the imperial census itself. The subject is no doubt full of difficulties, but considering its importance the space allotted to it is certainly small. We should also have welcomed a more detailed discussion of the origin and position of the 'coloni,' the class of free labourers bound to the soil, who fill so large a place in the legislation of the period, and on whom a vast amount of

ingenious speculation has been expended. We may note in passing that the conjecture (p. 78) as to the wide extent of the 'agri fiscales' in Italy is to some extent confirmed by the evidence of Cassiodorus. There is lastly a little inconvenience in the arrangement by which the account of the actual working and results of the system are relegated to a chapter at the end of the volume. Thus the part played by guilds such as that of the 'navicularii,' and the influence of financial necessities on the development of the colonate, are treated of apart from the general tendency to stereotype the machinery of society, which is so marked a characteristic of the Later Empire, but for an account of which the reader must turn to p. 444. Numismatic questions have evidently a special attraction for Prof. Schiller, and not the least valuable parts of his book are his account of Diocletian's reform of the coinage (pp. 147 *sqq.*), and such discussions of the evidence derived from coins, as that in the chapter (pp. 204 *sqq.*) on the attitude of Constantine towards the Christian Church. On the other hand, Prof. Schiller leaves the problem of the real meaning of Diocletian's famous edict 'de pretiis rerum venalium' very much where it was.

The relations between the Church and the Empire the author has treated with as much care and completeness as his limited space allowed. The chief interest of his work here lies in his endeavour to trace the gradual change in the imperial policy from one of friendly neutrality to one of declared partisanship, a change which elevated the Church to a position which was incompatible with the 'staatliche Omnipotenz' of the emperor (p. 415), 'damit war ein höhere Gewalt über dem absoluten Kaiser anerkannt' (p. 436). Thus while fully allowing the influence of the Church in saving Roman civilisation and even the Roman state from extinction, he places it side by side with the inroads of the barbarians as one of the forces hostile to the imperial system in the fourth century.

The barbarian advance is not so satisfactorily handled. In the fifth and last chapter Prof. Schiller indeed notices briefly the barbarising, as it is called, of the empire, by the wholesale settlements of barbarian captives in the provinces, the increasing use of them in the imperial army, and the frequent elevation of barbarians to high posts in the imperial service. He lays stress also on the fact that to the lower classes within the empire the barbarians not seldom

brought relief from intolerable burdens (p. 440). But we miss any chapters such as those on the ecclesiastical policy of Constantine, or of Gratian and Theodosius, dealing with the question as a whole, and

even so critical a moment as that of the admission of the Goths by Valens is treated in far too incidental a fashion.

H. F. PELHAM.

STUDIA BIBLICA.

(Continued from p. 197.)

THE essay of Bishop Wordsworth above referred to is 'On the Corbey MS. of St. James,' an old Latin MS. (ff.) now in St. Petersburg; and Prof. Sanday has supplied 'Further Remarks' on the same MS. The hypothesis of Bishop Wordsworth is that the original language was Aramaic, and that the Corbey version is not derived from our present Greek text but from a different translation. Amongst the passages which he thinks this hypothesis helps to explain are: ii. 7, 'blasphemant in bono nomine,' v. 2, 'res [for vestes] vestrae tiniaverunt' where the confusion of 'res' and 'vestes,' impossible in Greek, might occur from the double sense of the Aramaic *mān*. However, he also quotes Dr. Hort's suggestion that *ues-* has been lost before *res vestrae*. In confirmation of his hypothesis of an Aramaic original, he shows by an analysis of the vocabulary that the writer 'must have had a rather wide range of classical reading.' It seems to us that the rare words found in the Epistle do not suffice to prove this. They may have been familiar colloquially and locally. The word *περπερεύσθαι* in 1 Cor. xiii. 4 is found, we believe, only once in any other Greek writer, and that much later than St. Paul. But the compound *ἐμπερπερεύσθαι* is used by Cicero (*ad Att.* i. 14) in a way which makes it probable that it was a familiar word. And such words as *ἀνέμιζω*, *δαμονιώδης*, *χρυσόδακτύλιος*, may well have been colloquially used; *ἀνέμιζω* is given by Hesychius as an explanation of another word (*ἀναμίξαι*): *χρυσόδακτύλιος* is also used by him in explanation of another word. Both it and *δαμονιώδης* occur in Greek Scholiasts. Such facts are indications of popular use.

Prof. Sanday in his essay on the same Corbey MS. compares it minutely with the Vulgate, Jerome's quotations and the so-called *Speculum* of St. Augustine, and concludes (differing herein from the Bishop), that the Corbey MS. and the Vulgate do not proceed from fundamentally different stocks, whereas the text of the *Speculum* does pro-

ceed from a different source. He thinks that the Vulgate text in this Epistle owes extremely little to Jerome, and that the peculiarities in the Corbey text are due to a definite local recension. Some words of Lagarde go to the root of the question, Whence arose the marked differences? Replying to Hartel (who said that the scribe of the Verona MS. seemed like a grammarian teaching boys how to vary their expressions, preferring for no probable reason *pacificis* to *pacatis*; *nefaria* to *nefanda*, etc.) Lagarde observes that 'the probable cause was that in the learned or popular speech of the district for which the MS. was intended the one word was not in use, and therefore had to be replaced by another.'

With reference to the old Latin texts generally, Prof. Sanday concludes from his examination of the first two Gospels that there were two parent stocks and not more, the African and European. The Vulgate of St. James is mainly European, but with a peculiar element, not necessarily African. However, in *Old Latin Texts*, p. cclv, he withdraws this expression of opinion as to the fundamental separation between the two families of texts, thinking that the time for a definite conclusion had not yet come.

Mr. Gwilliam examines a Syriac Biblical MS. of the fifth century (*Brit. Mus. Add.* 14459, fol. 1—66), containing the first two Gospels. The text does not differ in any essential particular from that of Widmanstadt, and such differences as exist affect but very slightly the relation of the Syriac version to the original Greek text. We give a few instances:—

Matt. xvii. 21 not omitted (om. N* B.)

xix. 17 agrees with Text. Rec.

xxiv. 36 has not οὐδὲ ὁ υἱός.

xxvii. 35 = Rec.

Mk. vi. 11; ix. 44, 46. xv. 28 = Rec.

The last verses of St. Mark are given without any note of doubtfulness. In Matt. xxviii. 18 it adds (with the printed Peshito), 'and as my Father sent me I send you.'

On Matt. viii. 15 Mr. Gwilliam (p. 160) quotes this MS. as agreeing with Widmanstadt and the Curetonian in reading *αἰροῖς*, whereas on p. 171 he quotes it as reading *αἰρῶ*.

The text does not approximate to the Curetonian. On the whole Mr. Gwilliam derives from his study of Syriac MSS. a strong conviction in favour of the type of Greek text represented by the later MSS.

Prof. Sanday, on the other hand, from the phenomena of the *Codex Rossanensis* (Σ) draws an inference of an opposite kind. That *Codex* containing the first two Gospels is believed to date from the sixth century. It supports generally the common text, and is in some places the oldest uncial authority that does so. Nevertheless it is found to contain eighty-six manifestly wrong readings which have little or no support besides. 'And yet there is no difference in kind between these readings and those which form so large a part of the characteristic text of the great mass of MSS.' Its agreement with

these in other cases therefore tends rather to confirm the suspicion of wholesale correction and emendation to which they are exposed.

This MS. is so closely related to that known as N (also a *Codex Purpureus*) which contains fragments of the same Gospels, that Von Gebhardt thinks they may even have been copied directly from the same exemplar.

Space will not allow us to do more than mention the titles of the remaining essays: Prof. Driver 'On Recent Theories on the Origin and Nature of the Tetragrammaton'; Mr. Woods 'On the Septuagint Version of the Books of Samuel'; Mr. Edersheim 'On Wetzel's Theory of the Synoptic Gospels'; Prof. Sanday 'On the Commentary attributed to Theophilus of Antioch'; Mr. Randell 'On the date of S. Polycarp's Martyrdom' (which with Jahn, Lightfoot, etc. he fixes in 155 A.D.); and Mr. Neubauer 'On some Temanite and Nabataean Inscriptions dating from between 3 B.C. and 79 A.D.'

T. K. ABBOTT.

The Truth about Homer. With some remarks on Professor Jebb's 'Introduction to Homer.' By F. A. PALEY, M.A., LL.D. London, F. Norgate, and the 'Cambridge Chronicle' Office. 1887. 24 pp. 1s.

WE all know Mr. Paley's views on Homer. The real Homeric poems were the poems on the later events of the siege and the returns of the heroes, which we commonly call 'cyclic'; the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* are manufactured epics only just older than Plato. In this pamphlet, Mr. Paley goes over the old ground, with no new arguments, but only a long moan over the sad perversity of Mr. Jebb in disregarding the old ones. Of course, there is no reviling or railing, no bitterness or insinuation, in Mr. Paley's language; in one sentence he gets as far as '*suppressio veri*,' but he retracts it in the next. He is not indignant, he is only sad. He knows the truth; the world and Mr. Jebb will neither believe nor listen.

We may say at once that Mr. Paley does disprove the theory which he attacks, the theory that the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, just as they are, with every word and every line just as we have them, were finished before 800 B.C. But then that is a theory that nobody believes, not even Dr. Hayman. Everybody believes that the poems, as we have them, have undergone some amount of change since their origin; the question is, how much change, and what kind of change. Mr. Paley only refutes antagonists who hold that there has been no change at all. And, very strangely, Mr. Paley's theory is far more hostile to the irresistible internal evidences of growth in the poems as we have them, than the theories of his most old-fashioned opponents. He thinks, as they do, that the poems were written all at once; but while they leave plenty of time for interpolations and modernizations, he leaves no time at all; all the discrepancies of story, all the double redactions, all the differing usages of language, must have been put in by

the same author, with his eyes open, and then have spread over the world at once, stereotyped in the form which they have retained for 2200 years. Of course, Mr. Paley puts these down to the variations in the poet's sources; and that might stand when he used to regard the poet as a mere compiler, (though even then what a stupid compiler he must have been!); but in this pamphlet the theory of compilation is practically given up. Mr. Paley still talks about 'editing' and 'redaction,' and 'these poems in their new and highly elaborated form'; but when he says (p. 4) that 'Plato used a literary written epitome or "redaction" of the two poems, constructed each round a central figure, a dramatic *Protagonistes*, in an age of rhetoric, high culture, sophistic teachings of the rights and duties of humanity'; when he explains that Penelope's suitors are an imitation of Helen's suitors, and Odysseus's beggary at Ithaca is a reproduction of his beggary in the Trojan camp, that the characters of Helen and Menelaus are not degraded by Sophocles and Euripides, but elevated by the new poet from the savage level of the old epics, —when Mr. Paley does all this, he is describing, not a redactor at all, but an independent poet, with an independent poet's responsibility for unity of treatment.

¹ This is the strangest of Mr. Paley's sayings, and deserves full quotation. Pp. 12, 13. 'It was thus, that in an age when women had begun to take their just part in social life, a Helen and a Penelope were invested with new attributes, and Helen ceased to be the "she-devil," the Erinyes of the tragedies, and became a kindly and hospitable matron. In the same way the Odysseus and the Menelaus of our Homer are by no means the treacherous villains that they are uniformly made to appear in tragedy. It is a perverse view that the bad character shews "decadence" from the good, as represented by Homer. Why should the poets of the most cultured age in Attica have systematically preferred the bad? Rather, we have to contemplate the evolution from savagery to Socratic teaching. No man of sense now holds that early man was good and moral, just and chaste, and that later man became depraved.' (The italics are my own.) But the tragedians lived in the 'cultured age' as well. Why did they leave the brutal Menelaus and the wanton Helen unrebuked?

But in truth, so far as this theory of the date is concerned, refutation is more than Mr. Paley has a right to demand. The end of the 5th century B.C. is not one of the dark ages; if in the time of Aristophanes there appeared an epic poet of 27,000 lines, totally at variance with the traditions of his predecessors, and yet received at once into triumphant popularity all over the Greek world, he must have left some trace of his existence in our extant literature. If he could exist and be buried in silence, there is no reason why we should not believe that Greece was full of greater generals than Brasidas and greater poets than Sophocles and greater cities than Athens. History is at an end, and we had better burn our books.

Because Mr. Paley's theory is untenable, we may not therefore dismiss all his incidental observations. It is perfectly true that there are great difficulties connected with the sources of tragic story; (but what possesses Mr. Paley to include Mr. Jebb among people who do not 'possess any special acquaintance with the themes of the Tragic'?) with the history of writing; with the structure of the Homeric language. To persevere in insisting on the difficulties is itself a good work; but there, I am afraid, Mr. Paley's services to Homer end. It is sad to say it of such an indomitable scholar, who has laboured so long in so many fields; but, so far as the Homeric language is concerned, he does not know the conditions of the problem. 'Such evident sacrifice of grammar to metrical convenience as *πληθὺν δ' οὐκ ἂν ἐγὼ μυθήσομαι οὐδ' ὀνομήνω*,' 'the rare words *τείρεα* 'stars' and *τέλσον* came from Sanscrit,' 'the frequent use of *ἐὼς* as *tuus*. . . . these spurious modernisms also in the *Iliad* (*ἐὼς* being thinly disguised under a reading *ἔως*).' The man who can say these things is scarcely one from whom we can hope to learn 'the truth about Homer.'—T. C. SNOW.

Orphica, recens. EUGENIUS ABEL, in Schenkli's *Bibliotheca*, Pragae et Lipsiae, 8vo. 1885, pp. 320, 5 Mk.

THE editor of this work is already favourably known by his labours in the same field, having brought out in 1881 a careful edition of the *Lithica*. It is a field in which very little has been done by English scholars since the days of Tyrwhitt and Dr. Askew. The reason of this must be sought, we suppose, in the comparatively slight importance attached to the subject; since the condition of the Orphic texts has long been such as to offer the fullest scope for critical emendation. As Abel speaks in his preface of an 'editio major,' for which he is reserving his commentary, the present work must be taken as an instalment only. Its merits consist in a more thorough revision of the text; a better arrangement of the Fragments, by which they are grouped as far as possible under the headings of works known to have once existed; and in a considerable addition to the number of such *disiecta membra* hitherto collected. The last piece in this edition, the *Hymnus in Isim*, was only recovered about forty years ago from a marble slab in the island of Andros. It is unfortunately in a mutilated condition.

It is to the state of the text, as here represented, that the student will turn with most curiosity. The amount of Orphic lines, when some are recovered from writers as late as Marsiglio Ficino, will be a matter of less interest to him than their restoration to their primitive form. And certainly, when we consider that the manuscripts to be worked with are mostly of the 15th, or even 16th century, the task of such restoration will be seen to be a difficult one. Great latitude must, in such a case, be left to conjecture; the misfortune being that readings so obtained

fail to carry the sort of conviction we experience, when a slight verbal change in the text of a good manuscript makes the sense clear. A very few instances, to which our space limits us, will enable the reader to judge in some measure for himself, and will also serve to indicate how much has already been done for the text. In *Argon.* 178 (the numbering is from Hermann's edition), the reading, as it stood in Eschenbach's edition of 1689, was

ἐν φθιτοῖσιν ἔτευξ', ἀσκληπιόιο εἵνεκα λάβης.

Hermann adopted Pierson's emendation of *ἐν φθιμένοισιν*, but altered *ἔτευξε* to *ἔταξε*, on the ground that the former word would not be used in such a connection. 'Ἀσκληπιού, of course, was an obvious change. Abel, we think rightly, edits

ἐν φθιμένοισιν ἔτευξ', Ἀσκληπιού, κ.τ.λ.

Such phrases as *ἀγνωστον τεύχειν* (*Od.* xiii. 191) seem to justify this usage of *ἔτευξε*. In *Argon.* 1068 the old reading of Esch. was

αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κ' ἐν τοῖσι δύνῃ ἀμείγαρτον ἔθγκαν ἀθάνατοι, κ.τ.λ.

Voss altered the κ' ἐν τοῖσι, which did not mend matters greatly. Hermann produced *αὐτὰρ οἱ Μινύησι δύνῃ, κ.τ.λ.*, which, with its lengthening of *αὐτὰρ*, could satisfy no one. Abel accepts the ingenious conjecture of Wiel, *ἐπειγομένοισι*. Dr. Wiel, in his *Observationes* (1853), had started a number of emendations of the *Argonautica*, many acute, others over bold. Now and then Abel improves upon these, as in *Argon.* 1114-5, where (speaking of the Macrobian) the old text had

μελιχίη δέ τοι αἰὲν ἐπ' ὀφρύσι νεύσε γαλήνη παιδεσιν ἥδ' ἐποικεύσιν ἐπὶ φρεσίν, ἥδ' νόοιο, αἰσμά τε βέξειν, κ.τ.λ.

Hermann altered the latter part of the second line to *ἐπὶ φρεσίν οἶδαν ἐοῖσιν*. Wiel, objecting to *οἶδαν*, suggested *ἐνφροσύνῃ δὲ νόοιο*. Abel, with *ἐπιφροσύνῃ*, seems to us to be nearer the mark.

In *Frag.* xlvii. (Herm.), where the old reading was

πρώτιστος μὲν ἀναξ ἐκ ἐπιχθονίων Κρόνος ἀνδρῶν,
and where Hermann could propose nothing better than *ἀπ'* for *ἐκ*, Abel happily restores

πρώτιστος μὲν ἀνασσειν, κ.τ.λ.

In *Πηλην.* lxiv. (on *Νόμος*), γ. 6

καὶ φθόνον οὐ δίκαιον βόλζου τρόπον αὐτὸς ἐλαύνει,
while *οὐ δίκαιον* seems certainly corrupt, neither Hermann's *οὐ νόμιμον* nor Wiel's *οὐτιδανόν*, accepted by Abel, will probably carry conviction. More satisfactory is *καὶ μῦνευ ἀμείαντον*, *Lith.* 362, for the old *καὶ σεμνὸν ἀδιδαντον*. One of the most difficult to decide upon is the proper name at the beginning of *Argon.* 751, where the course of the Argo near the Tauric Chersonese is being described. As they stood in Eschenbach's text, the lines were

*οὐ σύμης ὕρος ἐστὶ, πολὺς τ' εὐθαλῆς λειμῶν
ἐνθάδ' ἀράξω βεῦμα μεγαβρεμέτου ποταμοῖο.*

'Symen nemo novit,' wrote Hermann, and gave the improved reading

*οὐ Σίνδης ὕρος αἰπύ, καὶ εὐθαλέες λειμῶνες
ἐνθα δ' Ἀράξω βεῦμα, κ.τ.λ.*

This Abel retains. But the instance may serve to show on how conjectural a basis the text yet rests. The Sindi are no doubt mentioned by Strabo as in the Maeotic region referred to; but there is no striking resemblance between *Σύμης* and *Σίνδης*. Old Dr. Vincent, of Westminster, in his annotated copy of Gesner's *Orpheus*, conjectured *Σοδάνης* (the Soanians being mentioned in the same chapter of Strabo, *Lib.* xi. c. ii.). It is just possible that

Δύμη may prove the true reading. In cursive MSS. the confusion between σ and δ (*σῶμα* for *δῶμα*, etc.) is common. *Δύμη* is well known as the name of the Achaean town, near the western promontory Araxus. And the *Ἀχαιοί*, supposed descendants of the Thesprotian Achaeans who came in the Argo, are specified by Strabo as settled with other tribes near the Caucasus. He mentions them in the same list as the Sindians. There is no proof that they had named one of their towns after the Dyme in the Peloponnese. But the thing is not impossible, and it is a little noticeable that the old reading *Ἀράξου*, just after, would give the name of the rocky promontory near the Achaean Dyme.

The reader will infer, from what has been said, that the editor's task has been well and carefully discharged. It may be added that the printing is very good. *Emendatio* (Praef. p. 1) should be *Emendationes*; and the year 1844 (p. 295, n. 1.) appears to be incorrectly given. We shall look with interest for the appearance of Abel's larger edition of the *Orphica*.—J. H. L.

Demosthenis Orationes selectae. In usum scholarum
edidit C. WOTKE. Leipzig, Freytag. Prague,
Tempky. 1887, pp. 77; 60 Pf.

FOR the sum of less than eightpence we have here a text of eight of the public speeches of Demosthenes, printed in the following order:—the first Philippic, the three Olynthiacs, the *De Pace*, the second Philippic, the *De Chersoneso* and the third Philippic. We have also a very brief Latin argument to each, as well as a short life of the orator, a woodcut of his statue in the Vatican, a map in illustration of the history of the time, an index of proper names, and one or two pages of critical appendix. The text is mainly that of the eighth edition of Westermann's select orations, as revised by Rosenberg in 1883, with a few alterations due to the fourth edition of the Teubner text of the first nineteen speeches, as revised by Blass in 1885.

The life, which extends over three pages without a break, and without even a capital letter to mark the beginning of each sentence, would obviously be improved by being broken into paragraphs. The woodcut of the Vatican statue is fairly satisfactory.

The map unfortunately does not extend further south than Argos, and accordingly excludes several places and districts to which Demosthenes refers, such as Laconia and Messenia, Megalopolis, Cos and Rhodes. Thespieae, though mentioned twice (*de Pace* 10 and *Phil.* ii 30), is neither marked on the map nor recorded in the index. In the latter, the Erythraeans, named in *Chers.* 24, are described as *incolae urbis Erythrarum in Boeotia prope Plataeas sitae*; whereas it is clear from the context and, in particular, from the mention of Chios and Asia, that the orator refers to Erythrae on the coast of Asia, opposite Chios, and not to Erythrae in Boeotia. In the same index Thasos, which is vaguely defined as an *insula maris Aegaei*, has surely quite as much right as Lemnos to be called an *insula maris Thracii*. To the description of *Καβύλα* as an *urbs Thraciae*, should be added *situs incerti*; and to that of *Μάστειρα*, *aliunde ignota*. The 'Carian' whom, at the date of the delivery of the *De Pace*, B.C. 346, the Athenians 'are allowing to hold possession of Chios, Cos and Rhodes' (§ 25, *ἐῴμεν καταλαμβάνειν*), is not the *rex Cariae Mausolus*, as stated in the index; for Mausolus, who originally took possession of those islands, had died several years before the speech was delivered; and the prince of Caria, at the time, was his brother Idrieus.

The readings adopted by the editor, who makes no suggestions of his own, do not appear to call for any

special remark. But in a book meant for school-boys, *quibus tradere non liceat nisi certissima*, as the editor himself remarks in his preface, it might have been better to desert the manuscript reading, when it involves the collocation of $\alpha\upsilon$ with the future participle, as in *Phil.* iii 70 (= 68 of this ed.) *πάλαί τις ἥδεως αὐτῶς ἐρωτήσων κήθηται*, and to accept *ἐρωτήσας*, which is proposed by Cobet and admitted into the text by critics of such learning and judgment as Weil and Blass. The critical appendix, which gives a conspectus of the forty instances in which the text of one or other of those critics is preferred to that of Rosenberg, includes no explanation, however brief, of the symbols used to designate the MSS quoted. It adopts the same abbreviation (*Herm.*) for the Greek rhetorician, Hermogenes; and for the German periodical, *Hermes*. Thus, in the references borrowed from Blass, *Herm.* iv 753 means the scholia on the former; and *Choric.* *Herm.* xvii 216, 9, the declamation of another rhetorician, Choricus, first printed in the latter. It ascribes *ὥσπερ ὑμῖν συμφέρον* in *Phil.* i 51 to "A. Schaefer Blass," instead of the MS χ , followed by G. H. Schaefer and Blass. Under *Ol.* ii 14 *καὶ τοι* is a mistake for *καὶ* (ante *δοῖ*); and on § 28, *εἰσφέρετε* is twice printed for *εἰσφέρετε*. On *Chers.* 61, as well as in the text, *προσῆκεν* is a mistake for *προσέκει*. This appendix is for the most part unintelligible except to those who have access to other editions of the text. What is the use of saying vaguely *ἀλλῶς οἰσίν*, or *δελεῖ τὴν μεταβολήν*, or *seclusi* 'Ἀμφίπολιν', without giving any clue as to the exact position in which those words are found in other editions? When the words themselves have vanished from the text, a mere reference to the section where they once stood is quite insufficient.

A careful perusal of the whole of the text has led to the detection of the following misprints: *Ol.* i 7 *ὥς...δεῖν* (for *δεῖ*), *Ol.* ii 10 'Ἀθηναῖνοι', *Ol.* iii 23 *αὖ τις*, *Chers.* 14 *μεταπέμπεται*, 61 *προσῆκεν* (for *προσέκει*), *Phil.* iii 26 *οὐδ'* twice for *οὐθ'*, 60 *οἱ δέ* (for *οἱ δὲ*), and in the index *Φερᾶ* for *Φερᾶ*. The punctuation, again, is often defective, although this is a point of special importance in a plain text intended for use in schools. Thus in *Ol.* i 11, *καὶ περὶ τῶν πραγμάτων οὕτως οἱ μὴ χρῆσάμενοι τοῖς καιροῖς ὀρθῶς οὐδ' εἰ συνέβη τι παρὰ τῶν θεῶν χρηστόν, μνημονεύουσιν*, we should either omit the comma after *χρηστόν*, or add a comma after *ὀρθῶς*. In *Chers.* 2, *ὅς κατὰ τοὺς νόμους ἐφ' ὑμῖν ἐστίν, ὅταν βούλησθε κολάζειν*, we expect a comma after *βούλησθε*. In *Phil.* iii 37, *ζῆλος, εἰ τις εἰληφέν τι γέλως, ἀν' ὁμολογῇ, μῖστος, ἀν' τοῖς τοῖς τις ἐπιτιμᾷ*, we clearly require a colon after *ὁμολογῇ*. Similar instances occur in *Ol.* ii 5; *Ol.* iii 17, 18, 33; *de Pace* 7; *Phil.* ii 3, 4, 13; and *Chers.* 12, 26, 67. In the index, it would have been better to distinguish the titles of several speeches by the symbols or abbreviations in ordinary use, instead of introducing a new notation by which VII stands for the *de Chersoneso*, and VIII for the *Third Philippic*, whereas these speeches, when denoted by Roman numerals, are elsewhere always numbered Or. VIII and IX respectively. In the speech last named, the numbering of all the sections from 8 to 74 is needlessly and injudiciously thrown out of agreement with that of other texts, by the omission of two sections which are not found in the two best manuscripts. Lastly the binding is far too flimsy for a school-book; the copy under review, though carefully handled, is already falling into pieces, and the connexion between the three Olynthiacs and the following speeches is at this moment hanging entirely on a single thread.

If, with the help of these and other suggestions, the editor will redeem his promise of doing his best to

improve the book, it may in time become sufficiently accurate to be worth binding and interleaving as a convenient text-book; but, for the present, our schools will do well to remain true to the Teubner text, especially as the volume containing these speeches has been recently revised with the minutest care by a critic of no less ability than Professor Blass.

J. E. SANDYS.

Plutarchi De Proverbiis Alexandrinorum. Libellus Ineditus. Recensuit et praefatus est OTTO CRUSIUS. Leipzig, Teubner. 1887. Mk. 2.80.

THE editor, in his introduction to this little collection of proverbs, maintains stoutly its Plutarchic origin. But the evidence is, from the nature of the case, far from convincing. The collection is, in none of the MSS., unambiguously assigned to Plutarch; and this absence of direct testimony is scarcely atoned for by such considerations as the interest in proverbial lore and the love of historical illustration revealed in Plutarch's acknowledged writings and supposed to be reflected in this assumed work of his, or by the fact that the historical characters referred to in this collection, together with the authorities such as Apio and Seleucus whom the collector must have followed, reach without exceeding the limits of Plutarch's life. Indeed if we regard internal evidence alone, it is not easy to trace in the comments on these proverbs the facile touch and kindly wisdom of the Sage of Chaeronea, though the proverbs themselves may partly account for this, as they are of the erudite order and contain as little mother-wit as their origin would lead us to expect. But viewed in the light rather of paroemiography than of literature, the collection has its interest; and after having been known in manuscript since the time of Erasmus, it has now been for the first time edited and provided with a full critical apparatus. The editor has further described the fortunes of the work of Zenobius with which those of this collection have been closely—indeed almost inextricably—associated. It is perhaps unnecessary to explain that the latter, whoever its author may be, is to be distinguished from the 'liber spurius' of Wytttenbach's *Moralia* and Leutsch and Schneidewin's *Paroemiographi Graeci*. Its title is not Πλουτάρχου παροιμίαι αἰς Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ ἐχρῶντο (but (Πλουτάρχου) περὶ τῶν παρ' Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ παροιμιῶν). It has no separate existence in the work of the Göttingen editors, but almost all the proverbs it contains may be found in one or other of the collections they give. (The only exceptions I have noted are δανάκη, συνομιώτερος Ἀγκύθου, δ φθὰς σοι λελάληκεν, γράφαις πρὸς τὴν Ἀρτεμιν). It is this 'contamination' which presents the great difficulty; and though he has made the most of the help of three MSS. in which the proverbs in question stand by themselves, Crusius is himself compelled to admit that the work he gives is but a fragment and one containing many uncertainties both of ascription and of reading.—W. RHYS ROBERTS.

Eudoxi ars astronomica qualis in charta Aegyptiaca superest. Denuo edita a FREDERICO BLASS. Kiliae MDCCCLXXXVII. 1 Mk.

THIS tract, which cannot be called interesting to the mathematician or the historian of mathematics, appears to be principally valuable as a confused work affording ample scope to an ingenious editor for emendation and reconciliation with notions of Eudoxus elsewhere acquired.

Eudoxus lived from B.C. 408 to B.C. 355, and was noted as an astronomer as well as geometer, physician, and legislator. His work on practical astronomy,

the *Φαινόμενα*, is the foundation of Aratus's extant poem. The tract now in question is credibly argued to bear date between 193 and 165 B.C. It was found on a papyrus in the Egyptian Museum at Paris, and first edited by Brunet de Presle in 1865. The handwriting is not that of a professional copyist, and the spelling is bad; hence it is supposed that we have here, not a copy of a treatise written by Eudoxus himself, but the work of an unskilled pupil of an Eudoxean school. Part of it is written in iambs, and it is prefaced by twelve iambs in acrostic form, the initial letters making up ΕΥΔΟΞΟΥΤΕΧΝΗ.

The editor makes it his business to determine what in the treatise is Eudoxus' own, and what the superstructure of his pupil's ignorance. The names of the planets and certain other descriptions are held to be genuine, while anything which appears to the editor unworthy of Eudoxus is attributed to the pupil. For an account of the dogmas attributed to Eudoxus we must refer to the dissertation itself: we will give only one illustration of the editor's procedure. The tract asserts that the sun never suffers total eclipse, while the moon does; at this statement, says Blass, there is perhaps no cause for astonishment, because of the rare occurrence of those total eclipses of the sun which are visible from one spot on the earth's surface. But the further statement that the moon is larger than the earth he scouts as unworthy of Eudoxus as a mathematician, seeing that it is the intervention of the earth which totally eclipses the moon. The tract further asserts that the ratio, in magnitude, of the earth to the moon is that of a musical fourth to a fifth, i.e., Earth : Moon = $\frac{3}{4} : \frac{3}{5} = 9 : 8$. Blass cannot bring himself to believe that a mathematician of Eudoxus' calibre could suppose both the sun and moon to be larger than the earth. Assuming, then, this negative, and, further, that Eudoxus did not suppose the moon alone to be larger than the earth, Blass's conclusion that Eudoxus held the descending order of magnitude to be earth, sun, moon, is at least as probable as the other possible alternative! Blass accordingly alters the text so as to change the order, sun, moon, earth, into the order, earth, sun, moon. And now, says he, the ratio 9 : 8 above mentioned is clearly not the ratio of the earth to the moon, as it is said to be, but the ratio of the earth to the sun; and once more the text is altered accordingly.—T. L. HEATH.

Scholia in Euripidem. Ed. E. SCHWARTZ. Vol. I. Scholia in Hecubam Orestem Phoenissas. (Reimer: Berlin. Price, 9 Mark.)

THIS edition of the Euripidean scholia differs essentially from the edition of Dindorf. While Dindorf published all the scholia he could find, including the late Byzantine with their utterly worthless repetitions, Herr Schwartz prints only the scholia vetera, confining himself to the four best MSS., namely the well-known Marcian of the twelfth century (M), Vatican 909 of the thirteenth (A), Parisinus 2713 of the thirteenth (B), and a Turin MS. (for the Orestes and Phoenissae) (T). He considers that these four MSS. contain the data for arriving at the most ancient recension of the old scholia on the Hecuba, Orestes and Phoenissae; and to arrive at such an original recension seems to be the chief interest in studying Euripidean scholia. It is only rarely that they throw much light on the text or interpretation of the author, and they usually need but little illustration themselves. Thus they have neither the charm of obscurity like the Medicean scholia on Aeschylus, nor the merit of elucidation like the scholia on Aristophanes. Nevertheless they have sometimes been helpful. A scholion suggested to

Valekenær a generally received correction in a line of the Hippolytus, and some clever emendations of Weil can be supported by hints in the scholia. A scholion on Orestes l. 327, it may be remarked, enables us to refute an attempt recently made to discredit *φοῖτος* as a non-existent word. (See Verrall, Sept. c. Theb., l. 661.) This scholion, *λύσσα καὶ μανία καὶ φοῖτος ἐν ἑστῶν*, shews that *φοῖτος* was at least in use. On l. 147 of the same play (*ἰδ' ἀπρεμαῖον ὡς ὑπέρφορον*) there is a note of more than usual interest, and Weil's rejection of the interpretation will perhaps be hardly considered final. *ὑπέρφορον* is connected with *δρόφος* a reed of downy nature (*λαχνήεντ' ὑρόφον*, Il. Ω 451), of which the tongues of flutes were made, and the passage is taken to mean, 'gently like a reed softly stirred' or 'a reed whispering in the wind.' MTAB contain this explanation in the same words; two of them M and B have an intermarginal note to a different effect (*τῶν μὴ δίκονομένων ἔξω τοῦ ὑρόφον ὅ ἐστι βραχύνειν*).

Herr Schwartz has pointed out many glosses and notes which were omitted by Dindorf, and has presented us with a much more accurate text, as was to be expected. He has not neglected to avail himself of the help of the inferior MSS.—for they are occasionally useful—; as for example, Orestes 15, where MTAB have *ἐρωτῶν*, Vat. 1845 has preserved *ἐρωτῶντι*. His edition will certainly supersede Dindorf's.

It is to be regretted that some steps are not taken to discover and collate that seventh century uncial palimpsest of Euripides which H. O. Coxe saw in the Levant and from which C. Tischendorf made a few extracts at Jerusalem. Coxe mentions it in his 'Report to Her Majesty's government on the Greek Manuscripts yet remaining in libraries of the Levant, London 1858,' but it is now quite unknown what has become of it. It would be perhaps of little value to Herr Schwartz for the scholia (cf. Preface, p. vii), but it would be of the greatest value for the text.

JOHN B. BURY.

Quæstiones Diodoræ Mythographiæ dissertatio inauguralis philologica quam...scripsit Ericus Bethé. (Göttingæ, 1887.) Mk. 2.40.

This is one of those elaborate *Quellenstudien*, which are so common in Germany and so rare in England. Herr Bethé's work exhibits all the learning and minuteness that might be expected from a pupil of Hermann Sauppe and Wilamowitz-Möllendorf, and for the student of mythology it will possess considerable interest on account of the great mythographical importance of the early books of Diodōros. One of the most important sources of Diodōros was always considered to be Dionysios Skytobrachion of Mytilênê, a writer of whom much has been written and little is known. The first chapter of Herr Bethé's treatise is devoted to this dim figure, and a conclusion of some interest is cleverly arrived at—that Dionysios did not write books for the learned, but *wrote romances for the general public*. In other words he did not reproduce mythological traditions from elder writers but adorned the existing and invented new legends, which the uncritical Diodōros 'swallowed,' writing of him *Διονυσίῳ τῷ συνταξαμένῳ τὰς παλαιὰς μυθοποιίας*. This conclusion is chiefly based on the fact that the tales about Bakchos which Dionysios attributes to the Libyans were evidently posterior to Alexander the Great, as they are borrowed from his adventures. The main result of the investigations is that Diodōros did not draw on Dionysios as much as has been generally supposed, for example by Heyne and Müllenhoff and E. Schwartz. His obligations to Timaios and Matris in Bk. iv. had already been pointed out by O.

Sieroka and Holzer respectively; and Bethé has carefully discussed both these sources. Of Matris we really know nothing. If Dionysios is little better than a name, Matris is little better than the shadow of a name. A great many narrations in Diodōros are shewn to have been drawn from an unknown source which was also utilized by Apollodōros in his Bibliotheca. The minor limit for the date of this compendium is of course 44 B.C. or thereabouts, the time at which Diodōros began to write; and Bethé ingeniously fixes a major limit at about 100 B.C. by shewing that Dionysios, who probably lived at that time, was mentioned in it.—JOHN B. BURY.

De Callistrato et Philonide sive de actionibus Aristophanis scripsit ALBERTUS BRIEL. Berolini, 1887. 8vo. Pp. 68. Mk. 1.60.

THIS is a useful and instructive pamphlet on a difficult subject. Briel advocates the view that both Callistratus and Philonides were comic poets, not actors. He holds also that in those cases in which a writer either of tragedies or comedies put his play into the hands of some one else to exhibit, the rule was for the real author's name to remain unknown, at all events until after the prizes were awarded. It follows from this that in comedies the poet had to conceal his real identity in the parabasis, and make the exhibitor speak in his own person. This, it will be seen, has a most important bearing upon the study of Aristophanes, and Briel shows much ingenuity in this part of his treatise. He has gone carefully over the ground, and sheds new light upon many places. There is also good sense in the way in which he treats the exaggerations of comedy, such as the joke about the Lacedæmonians and Aegina in *Ach.* 654, and the question of the poet's baldness.

There is one verbal conjecture made which certainly merits consideration, that of *κακίστος* for the unmetrical and unmeaning *κακίστορις* in *Vesp.* 1284.

Some few points require correction. On p. 5 he depends for an argument upon brackets in Dindorf's edition of the *Scholia*. In this case the brackets do not imply what Briel thinks. They are Dindorf's equivalent for Hermann's asterisks (see Hermann's *Nubes*, p. xiii.) Again, the passage from the *Acharnians* quoted on p. 14 does not prove Briel's point. It only shows that the spectators did not know the order in which the plays were to come at the festival.

W. GUNION RUTHERFORD.

L'Éloquence judiciaire à Rome pendant la République, par JULES POIRET. Paris: 1887. 5 fr.

M. POIRET's clear and interesting Essay may be strongly recommended to classical students, none the less because works on eloquence or the art of Rhetoric are rare, especially in England, where the name of Rhetoric is misunderstood and the study of it as an art discouraged, in spite of its great influence under our institutions. Mr. Forsyth's 'Hortensius' (on the development of judicial oratory and the bar), a book in style somewhat like M. Poiret's, is a brilliant exception, but it stands almost alone.

M. Poiret, after a brief but spirited preface on the importance of judicial eloquence among the ancients, its preponderance over other styles, and its close connection with political eloquence, followed by an interesting chapter on the topography of the Roman Forum, proceeds to place in turn on the stage so prepared all the chief figures and component parts of a Roman trial, viz.: the Presidents (or judges) and their assessors, the Judges (or jury), the position

of the accused and his advocates, that of the accuser, the course of procedure, the order of speeches, the character of the judicial sentence, &c.; and he finishes the essay with two chapters on the characteristics of eloquence most preferred at Rome and most adapted to Roman character. Under all these headings are grouped interesting notices of forms and customs ingeniously and laboriously extracted from casual allusions in Cicero's letters, speeches, or rhetorical works, or from Plutarch, Quintilian and others, e.g., about the preliminaries, the open-air pleadings, and the varying place of the tribunal, the crowd surrounding it (though it is hardly fair [p. 52], to take Plautus' description of it as correct), the officers of the court, the forms of procedure, challenges of jury (p. 85), its numbers (p. 87), the limit to length of speeches, the duration of trial (as with us, till lately, rarely longer than a day) (p. 20), its adjournment (corresponding to our new trial or appeal), the indirect remuneration of counsel, forbidden to receive pay (p. 178) (a theory perpetuated at the English and French bars as well as in other modern professions). All these are interesting topics well brought out and well worth comparing with modern customs. As regards the conduct of the case M. Poirer argues (in opposition to Madvig) that the order as a rule was, first, pleadings, then witnesses, then the *altercationes*, though this order was often varied.

Chapter vi. 'On the orators,' contains some interesting passages, especially (pp. 136-9), some remarks on the rhetoricians who succeeded the orators, and, inheriting their gift of utterance, 'continued speaking when they had nothing to say,' and their treatises, which he wittily describes as 'inventories of the effects of deceased oratory,' (*des inventaires après décès*), an apology for some of Cicero's weaknesses and inconsistencies (pp. 155-173), and some amusing satirical observations on the professional disinterestedness of unpaid advocates (pp. 174-181).

The remarks on Cicero's oratorical style are discriminating, and the allusions to Mommsen's indiscriminating disparagement of him (pp. 135, 237, 254) no less pungent and to the point.

In Chapter x., *urbanitas* and *gravitas* are put down as the most distinctive features of Roman Eloquence, the one justly attributed to intimate relations between the magistrate, *judices*, and pleaders, similar to those that exist between our barristers and the judge, and such as did not exist at Athens; the other to the national character. On the other hand, the comparative weakness of the Roman in genuine vehemence and in the real pathetic style, as compared with the Greek, is ascribed mainly to the absence of that thrilling element of judicial oratory, the impending sentence of death (p. 278). It should be added that the *judices* at Rome were more select and educated or more luxurious and corrupt, demanded a more polished, artistic and pleasing style, and were not so likely, as the larger number of mixed Athenian jurors, to be carried away by 'the pathetic.'

The book, however, though interesting, is not always quite trustworthy, owing to some careless interpretations of certain passages or too hasty inferences from them. Some of these inferences are, to say the least, startling. What evidence is there that it was frequent or even possible in Rome for a presiding judge to play the advocate and actually leave his place on the bench to plead? (p. 71). The evidence adduced is (i.) a statement of Plutarch (*Pl. Cic. 9*, cf. Forsyth's *Cicero* I., 81), that Manilius' trial was purposely fixed by Cicero for the only remaining day of his pretorship, that he might help his cause, and a further statement that the people asked him to

act as advocate for him and that he did so act; but as Manilius' trial was eventually postponed, it was surely more likely that Cicero pleaded for him after he had ceased to be pretor than that he did so on the last day of his office and the first day of the trial at which he himself presided; (ii.) a remark of Asconius (*Pro Cornelio Fr. Argum.*) that Cicero, in the year of his pretorship, defended C. Cornelius. But Asconius goes on to say that Q. Gallius *exercuit hoc iudicium*. So there is at least no evidence that he or any one else acted as pretor and advocate in the same case. And (iii.) Cassius (p. 72) may have been famous as a judge for his strict insistence on the *cui bono* argument, but it only rests on Asconius' authority that, as *quaestor iudicii*, he pressed this argument on the judges (*praibat iudicibus ut quaereretur cui bono fuisset*), and even this only goes a very little way towards the conclusion suggested. That the pretor could exercise influence by his control of procedure and in the choice of court, jury, and time of trial, and, indirectly, by showing his sympathies, is true; but it is very doubtful whether Cicero means more than this in his impudent boast (*Cic. Att. 1, 4, 2*) of having gained popularity by the condemnation of Macer, when tried before him; which reminds us of a saying reported of a modern judge that he had only lost two cases since he became a judge.

Similarly the reader will be surprised to read on p. 154 that Hortensius '*fini par mourir d'une maladie causée par son intempérance de parole*,'—no doubt a very proper punishment for such intemperance, but hardly to be established as a fact by Cicero's remark (wrongly quoted), *Hortensii vox exstincta fato suo est, nostra publico* (*Brut.*, 96, 328). Another curious mistake seems to have been made on p. 267, where Cicero's mock-modest remarks on his own *Oratiuncula p. Deiotaro*, which he was sending to Dolabella (*Ad. Fam.*, ix., 12), are regarded as a severe criticism on Brutus' speech for the same king alluded to in *Brut.*, 5, 21, and consequently as proving that Cicero's praise of Brutus' eloquence was ironical,—a mistake quite incomprehensible if the whole letter be read, except on the assumption that for the moment Cicero's own speech was entirely forgotten.

A few other smaller errors or doubtful points might be pointed out, but they do not detract materially from the merits of the book, which ought to be one both interesting and useful to classical students.—J. E. NIXON.

HILDEBRANDT'S *Studien auf dem Gebiete der Römischen Poesie und Metrik*. I. VERGIL'S *Culex*.

THIS is an elaborate attempt to find the true *Culex*. The really critical part, the part which is valuable in itself and is in a great degree new and original, is to be found in sections I.—V. I will give as briefly as I can an abstract of the main arguments.

After the self-disparagement of *Cul.* 1—10, the pompous invocation 11 *sqq.* to Apollo and the Muses is unnecessary. It is also an obvious imitation of the Exordium of the *Aetna*. Consequently it cannot be by Vergil; though it bears unmistakable traces of imitation of Georgic I. Looking at the diction of 11—44 we seem to trace a Christian. *Sanctus puer* (v. 26), which Catullus applies to Amor, could not be applied by a contemporary to the young Octavius. It could only be addressed to him from the standpoint of a later time, when he was recognised as a god. That it is however meant for this Octavius (not Musa, nor any ordinary man) is clear (1) because the poet's disclaimer of any attempt to write an

heroic poem implies a superior, no doubt a great person, to whom such an offering would be acceptable; (2) *meis allabere coeptis* is copied from *audacibus adnuc coeptis* of Georgic i., which is similarly addressed to Augustus; (3) *Gloria perpetuum tuens* bespeaks a man of high consideration.

Returning to 1—10, this Exordium also cannot be by Vergil; *iocos musamque = musam iocosam*, *Pondere culicis famaue = pondere famoso c.* would be from him, even at sixteen, impossible.

The real *Culex* begins with *Propulit e stabulis ad pabula lacta capellas* (45). From this to 57 (omitting, however, v. 50, which betrays an inexact observation of the goat quite alien to the real poet of the *Culex*) is by Vergil; changing, however, in 57 *praestanti* to *prostanti*. (This suggestion I have anticipated, *Journal of Philology* for 1886, p. 256.)

The section 58—97, in which a country life is eulogised, is quite out of keeping with the accurate nature-painting of the opening section. It smells of the lamp, and is an obvious copy of the famous *O fortunatos nimium sua si bona norint* of Georgic ii.

The real *Culex* meets us again at v. 98, and continues to v. 109. In this section only four changes are required, 99 *capras* for *curas*, 106 *resabant* for *residebant*, 108 *hibiscis* for *in umbris*. *Haud procul ipse exit for ut procul aspecti*. The rest is quite Vergil.

But with v. 110 begins once more the interpolator. He betrays himself partly by the suddenness with which we are told that the scene (hitherto apparently Italian) is laid in Boeotia; partly by the rush of mythological allusions—Agave, Pans, Satyrs, Dryads, Naiads, Orpheus, Demophoon, &c., &c.; followed by a long list of trees (seemingly based on Ovid *Metam.* x. 90).

The genuine poem begins again at 157, and continues uninterruptedly till 201. Vv. 202—204 are interpolated, as is shown (1) by the renewed pedantry of the mythological allusions; (2) the expressions *equos quatit, in fessos requiem dare comparat artus*; (3) the omission of any mention of the goats being driven to their afternoon-pasture, an indispensable preliminary in any exact observer of goat-nature, and one which Vergil (as we know from *Geor.* iii. 335) would have taken care to supply. But 206—209 are genuine; and with 209 ends this, the largest and central section of the genuine *Culex*.

Of the remainder of the poem, 213—414, only a few lines are Vergil's. The rest, occupied as it is with a lengthy description of the Infernal Regions (vv. 213—222, 232—384), is a subsequent addition. Vergil, even at the age of sixteen, could never have made his Gnat describe itself as *praeda Choronis* while yet unburied. Yet how can it describe Tartarus, as it does, *without* such burial? As a whole, this episode, whilst feebly copied from *Aen.* vi., is greatly influenced by Christian ideas of Hell and Purgatory. It is difficult to say when it was written; possibly later than St. Augustine.

There are, however, pieces of this large section which are genuine. Vv. 210—212, 228—231, in which the Gnat complains of the goat-herd's ingratitude, and begs for a return of kind offices, i.e. in effect for a tomb, are a necessary sequel to the death of the serpent and the subsequent sleep of the rescued goat-herd, and may be accepted as Vergil's. Also 385—394, with a verse made up of the beginning of 395 and end of 411, then 412—414 form an unobjectionable finale.

Thus, after immense excisions, is obtained an ultimate *Culex* of 96 lines, symmetrically marked off into a centre or Omphalos of 48 vv. and two side-wings of 24 vv. each.

It is probable that few Englishmen will be prepared to accept a result so very sweeping. I must confess, for my own part, with all respect for Dr. Hildebrandt's care and ingenuity, that I cannot feel the sharply-marked difference of style which he finds in the genuine and non-genuine portions of the poem. If the work was written at all by Vergil, it would only be natural that a juvenile performance would present inequalities. If, again, any part of it was written by him, we should hardly expect the Vergilian portions to stand out against the non-Vergilian in the particular way which Dr. Hildebrandt supposes. For, in the first place, the work of Vergil at sixteen or eighteen would not necessarily be like his later verse; and, in the second, any one who added on to what he found of Vergil's would be more likely to catch the general style of all his works than the particular style of the *Culex*; the consequence of which would be, that the spurious portions were marked off from the genuine by a more elaborate rhythm, in which the caesuras, pauses and language of the Georgics and Aeneid were unconsciously or unavoidably imitated, producing a palpable inequality.

Again, is it true that we can distinguish two kinds of nature-painting in our *Culex*? Dr. Hildebrandt makes much of this, and recurs to it from time to time with great complacency. The poet of the one was an exact and minutely faithful copier of what he saw: the poet of the other was a closet-student, writing from the inspiration of his books and his night-lamp, and only painting as he had read. On the whole, I deny that any such sharp distinction exists here either. The assertion seems based on the description, 48 *sqq.*, of the goats browsing now in the woods and brakes, now in the valleys; now cropping the arbutus-berries, now raised on their hind-legs to seize a willow or alder bough. The passage is no doubt pretty, and will probably recur to most of those who read the poem through. But it does not seem to me more exact than the passage about trees which Dr. Hildebrandt condemns as spurious. Were I asked, indeed, to select what I consider the nearest approach to a minute word-picture, I should single out vv. 137—156.

Looking at the residuary *Culex* from the point of view of symmetry, we come upon another difficulty. If the sections were as carefully marked off from each other as Dr. Hildebrandt supposes

Side-wing.	Centre.	Side-wing.
(12 + 12.	12 + 12 + 12 + 12.	12 + 12),

in which, it will be observed, each of the parts is a multiple of 12, the uniformity of this segmentation would probably have been for greater clearness marked by some mechanical contrivance. Now granting that, after a time, this was lost or at least obscured, it would for all the time that the memory of it lasted, prevent any additions of so extensive a kind as we must suppose; for Dr. Hildebrandt's residuary original *Culex* is only 96 lines out of our extant 414. A forger would surely take care that his additions were not so violently out of proportion to the sum of what he found. If the *Culex*, say for two or three centuries, consisted of not more than 100 lines, the Christian who forged the additions (for this is the hypothesis) would never have swollen it out to more than 400.

I pass to a different part of the work, the emendations. These are numerous enough—more, indeed, than I for one can think at all necessary. Is it part of the present fashion to recur to the old style of Burges, who, it is said, carried 50,000 emendations with him in his carpet-bag?

The best of Dr. Hildebrandt's conjectures, I think, is in 172, *luem inculatur* for *luens maculatur*; this is really clever, and may be right. Ingenious, too, is *Spiritus accessit uentis* in 189 for *excessit sensus*. The others do not, in my opinion, attain to anything like probability. But it will be seen from the analysis given above that our author does not deal with the text of more than one half of the poem. He seems, too, by no means master of all that has been written on the *Culex* within the last ten years; at least no reference is made to my articles in the *American* and *Cambridge Journals of Philology*, *A. J. Ph.* iii. pp. 271—284, *Camb. J. Ph.* vol. xv. p. 250 sqq.—ROBINSON ELLIS.

P. Vergili Maronis Bucolica Georgica Aeneis recognovit OTTO GÜTHLING. Teubner series. 1886.

DR. O. GÜTHLING, who is known to Vergil students by his recently-published *Curae Vergilianae* (Liegnitz, 1886), has been entrusted with the editing of the new Teubner text of Vergil, a task which he has performed with wise conservatism. His edition is well printed, and issued separately in two parts, one containing the Eclogues and Georgics, the other the Aeneid; and is moreover furnished with a concise apparatus criticus, containing the chief Ms. variations and most probable emendations. It forms a valuable appendage to Ribbeck's edition, as it contains the more recent contributions to the criticism of Vergil, which are scattered about in pamphlets and periodicals. Of three new MSS. noticed, the Pragensis supplies some important readings; the Oenopontinus and Daventriensis, in the words of the editor, 'plane inutiles sunt ad emendanda Vergili carmina,' and this verdict seems just, though in Aen. xii. 208 Dr. Güthling rather inconsistently, and perhaps unnecessarily, accepts *vivo* for *imo* from the ed. Daventriensis. Much use has been made of the late Dr. Schaper's labours; and his clever emendation *certe* for *Cretae* has been printed in ec. i. 65. The editor's own emendations are rare; the ingenious *ulli* for *ullae* in Aen. xi. 567, deserves special notice. Dr. Güthling has discharged his duty with caution and acuteness, and has given us a text which deserves to become popular.—S. G. OWEN.

Eclogues of Calpurnius and Nemesianus, by C. H. KEENE, M.A. Deighton, Bell & Co. 1887.

MR. KEENE is already known as the editor of a selection from Ovid, and this little book will add to his reputation. The introduction discusses the authorship of the Eclogues, the date of the authors, the different MSS. and editions, and idyllic poetry generally. The literary criticism is perhaps rather heavy; 'the Mantuan bard' is a poor periphrasis for Virgil; but in dealing with matters of fact the editor is accurate and sensible. Mr. Keene does not profess to have contributed much to the criticism of the text; he follows generally Glaeser's edition of 1842; important various readings are given in critical notes inserted between the text and commentary. The explanatory notes are good and useful. No difficulties are passed over, and the solutions suggested are generally right. There are naturally slips here and there; *levat caput* (i. 10) is surely mistranslated; *terci* (iv. 152) certainly is so; *ingera* (iv. 119) in *divin ingera versat arator* should not be translated 'broad acres,' but rather *long*, if 'acres' is to have any epithet at all. A note should have been given on an irregular form of condition which occurs ii. 71 and elsewhere, and on the irregular sequence of tenses in iv. 32, 33. The spelling of such forms as *coena*, *quercla*, *bacca*, should be corrected in a new edition;

but above all the note on p. 18 of the introduction: there is a hacknied line of Juvenal which all editors of school-books should keep in mind, and which might prevent vagaries of this kind. These defects do not impair the substantial value of the book which should prove very useful in the middle forms of schools.

Selections from Tibullus and Propertius, by Professor G. G. RAMSAY, M.A., LL.D. Clarendon Press. 6s.

THIS edition contains about six hundred lines of Tibullus and twice as many of Propertius, with introductions and notes. It is written in the first instance to meet the wants of students in Glasgow University; and the editor also wishes to do his part to "rescue from comparative neglect the best portions of two of the most fascinating and suggestive of Latin poets." This neglect is not so general or complete as the preface would give one to understand: there are schools and universities where Propertius at least receives as much attention as he deserves; for, when all is said, Propertius is not a Virgil, and must give way to Virgil and Virgil's peers if the multiplication of modern studies makes it impossible to study all the Latin poets. The biographies of the two poets are well written, and tell one shortly the little which is known or can be guessed with tolerable certainty about them. The account of the MSS. might have been omitted: students who read selections are not likely to care about the history of the text. The text given is in the main that of Palmer, as Professor Ramsay shares his belief in the superiority of the Neapolitan MS. Each poem is divided into paragraphs, and the drift of each paragraph is given in an English heading—an arrangement which does not improve the look of the page, but certainly facilitates the task of the student. The explanatory notes are copious, clear and sensible. Many of the longer notes on Tibullus are taken from a commentary published by the late Professor W. Ramsay, now out of print; they show erudition, but they are too long, and would be more in place in a Dictionary of Antiquities. On Propertius the editor has had the advantage of Professor Palmer's advice; a remarkable reading of his is printed on p. 80 (III. 18, 21). The least satisfactory notes are those on points of syntax: *hodiernæ* cannot stand for *hodie* (Tib. 1, 7, 53); nor can *veneranda* be used in an active sense (*ib.* 56). The indicative in general conditions, though of course perfectly regular, seems unfamiliar to the editor. There are a number of trifling misprints which might have been removed by a short study of the proof-sheets; the same line of Horace, for example, is quoted twice (pp. 106, 235), and there are three variations of text in six words. The editor is fond of quoting English poetry, and generally quotes it appositely, but he does not always assign his quotations to their right owners; it was not Herrick who said, 'There is no armour against Fate.'

We see that Professor Ramsay thinks very poorly of Munro's contributions to the study of Propertius; see especially p. 363. Now Professor Ramsay has a perfect right to disagree with and to disprove Munro's conclusions, but the tone which Professor Ramsay chooses to express his disagreement, will seem to many to be ill chosen.

Titi Livii historiarum Romanarum libri qui supersunt ex recensione IO. NIC. MADVIGII. Quantum ediderunt IO. NIC. MADVIGIUS et IO. L. USSINGIUS. Vol. II. Pars. I.

THIS is a continuation of the fourth edition of Madvig and Ussing's well-known text, containing books xxi.

to xxv. inclusive. All the experiments in emendation which have appeared since the third edition was published in 1880 have been carefully examined and weighed, and the result (for which sober-minded scholars will be thankful) is a text varying practically very little from that of the last edition. Perhaps the main use, one might almost say, comfort, of such a recension guaranteed by such an authority is indicated in the last sentence of the preface to this edition, where, after mentioning one or two emendations, admitted or approved, the editor continues, *In aliis locis nunc quoque unum id relinquebatur ut prava commenta arcerem.*

T. Livii Ab Urbe Condita, Libri I. II. XXI. XXII. Adjunctae sunt partes selectae ex libris III. IV. VI. Scholarum in usum edidit ANT. ZINGERLE. I M. 40 Pf.

THIS is a book intended especially to meet the requirements of Austrian Gymnasias. In the 'Instructions' issued in 1884, the portions of Livy recommended to be read in such schools are Books I. and XXI., with either Book XXII. or portions of the first decade illustrating the struggle between the Orders. Prof. Zingerle has accordingly here edited Books I. II. XXI. and XXII. in full, and three selections from Books III. IV. and VI.: (1) III. 33-55, the Decemviral legislation, and the downfall of the Decemvirs; (2) IV. 1-9, the Canuleian Rogations, the appointment of military tribunes with Consular power, and of Censors; (3) VI. 34-42, the Licinian Rogations, and the first election of a Plebeian consul.

Besides the text, the book contains two maps, one of Italy, the other in three divisions, Central Italy, the Ager Romanus, and the City, a brief account in Latin of the life and writings of Livy, and a geographical index.

There are no explanatory notes. The text adopted seems to be that of Weissenborn as last edited, but with a good many variations from it catalogued in an appendix. Prof. Zingerle adopting some conjectural emendations not admitted by Weissenborn or Madvig, as for example in I. 14, 11, *densis abditam virgultis* for *densa obsita virgultis*, XXI. 31, 11, *novosque gignit gurgites*. *Ob haec, for novosque gurgites (ob haec . . .)*, &c.

The book is scarcely calculated to be suitable for general use in English schools, but the selected portions supplemented from Book II. and carefully edited might form a very useful school book.

H. M. STEPHENSON.

Die Krieggzüge des Germanicus in Deutschland, von Dr. FRIEDRICH KNOKE, Oberlehrer am Herzogl. Karls-Gymnasium zu Bernburg. Berlin, 1887. 15 Mk.

THE author has devoted a book of no less than 566 pages to the elucidation of a subject, the interest of which to his countrymen is shown by the prefixed list of works consulted, containing the names of no less than sixty-eight predecessors who have treated the whole question or some part of it. The whole subject is here fully discussed from all its data, and illustrated by five maps showing the general field of operations and various parts on an enlarged scale.

It is hardly possible here to do more than indicate briefly some of the principal conclusions arrived at respecting the geography of the events related by Tacitus.

The locality of the attack on the Marsi in the autumn of A.D. 14, after the mutiny (I. 50, 51), has always been somewhat difficult to define, as that people, and some others mentioned with them, had

soon afterwards so far disappeared as to have no district assigned to them in the 'Germania.' Dr. Knoke thinks that the Marsi lived west of the Chatti and south of the Lippe, and that Germanicus, after marching eastward alongside that river, turned upon them unexpectedly by a flank march on the right through the forests southwards.

Passing over the expedition in the spring of A.D. 15 against the Chatti, and the movement (which Dr. Knoke thinks took place along the line of the Lippe) to rescue Segestes (I. 57, 4), we come to the great campaign of that year. It is argued in this work that the various divisions of the army, taking different routes to the Ems, formed a junction at or near Rheine; Caecina, having reached that place by a direct north-easterly route from Vetera, the main body having marched up to it from their landing-place at the mouth of the river.

The chief point of geographical interest in this campaign is the locality of the defeat of Varus, on which so much has been written at various times. It may be remembered that, while most authorities had placed the site at or near Detmold, others (as Nipperdey) had placed it as far westward as Stromberg or Beckum, and that Mommsen, in a separate treatise on the subject, and a short summary in his last great work (*R.G.* v. p. 43; Engl. Transl. i. p. 47), has placed it at or near Barenau, between the sources of the Hunte and the Dümmer See.

It is impossible here to give even an abstract of an investigation occupying some 100 pages of the work before us, and illustrated by a map which cannot here be reproduced. As to the author's reasons for placing the scene of the catastrophe at or near Iburg, south of Osnabrück, his criticism of the grounds on which Mommsen had placed it at Barenau, and the inferences to be drawn from the large discovery of Roman coins of the period in the latter locality, those who desire information must be referred to the book itself.

Another much-vexed question, to which considerable space is given, is that of the retreat of Caecina and his force (I. 63-69), and especially the situation of the 'pontes longi' (I. 63, 6). In the discussion of some six or seven different opinions on this point, and the reasons given for fixing the locality northward of the Dümmer See, it is to be feared that we have only attempts to solve an insoluble question; inasmuch as, though it may be assumed that Caecina had to make his way to Vetera, the point at which he was detached from the rest of the army to take a separate route is one on which Tacitus leaves us wholly in the dark.

In the expedition of the spring of A.D. 16, the chief geographical point is the situation of Aliso (2, 7, 5). Dr. Knoke agrees with those who place it at or near Hamm, rather than, with Mommsen (p. 31; Eng. Tr. i. p. 34), further eastward, at Elsen, near Paderborn. The other fort on the Lippe (2, 7, 1) must have been, he thinks, a little further on, at or near Dolberg.

In the account of the great campaign of that summer, much space is given to the discussion of another question on which Tacitus gives us no help, that of the point on the Ems at which the army disembarked from its sea voyage, and the route taken from that river to the Weser. It may perhaps be fairly safe to conclude that the Ems was left at some point not higher than Lathen, and the Weser reached somewhere near Minden. Dr. Knoke thinks that the left bank of that river was followed for some distance round the great bend which it there makes, and that the Romans crossed in some place or places south of the 'Porta Westphalica.' He further argues that the

Roman camp was formed on the rising ground opposite the village of Erder, facing eastward, and that the Germans had collected further east on the height of Arensburg, in the first part of which word he thinks a name of the German war god (the 'Hercules,' cf. 2, 12, 1) may be traceable. The plain into which they descended to battle he places at Eisbergen (in the first syllable of which name he would trace the two first syllables of 'Idistaviso'), opposite Rinteln. He supposes that the defeated army was pursued eastwards along the river, perhaps as far as Oldendorf, and that the trophy (2, 18, 2) may have been erected on the height of Papenbrink, overlooking the battle-field and whole surrounding district.

On the subsequent line of march, and the site of the second great battle of this campaign, Tacitus (2, 19-21) is again altogether vague. Dr. Knoke concludes, on general geographical and strategical considerations, that this battle took place also on the Weser, at a lower point, probably at Leese (about thirty miles below Minden), where some remains, which he thinks may be those of the boundary fence of the Angrivarii (2, 19, 4), have been discovered.

The above is necessarily a most meagre outline of the principal contents of the book, and does no justice to what appears to be a most careful study of the geographical and other questions involved, and a full exposition and discussion of all views differing from those adopted.

No Englishman can well be in a position to offer criticism of a treatise involving so much minute local knowledge of German geography. Students of Tacitus may be on the whole inclined to doubt whether Dr. Knoke, though at times dismissing statements as merely rhetorical, is not on the whole disposed to follow that author too closely into detail.

Without going so far as to pronounce him, with Mommsen, 'the most unutilitary of writers,' we must own that, besides the disadvantages under which all ancient historians labour in their attempt to represent, without maps before them, the geography of distant countries, Tacitus is peculiarly apt to conceive campaigns and battles rhetorically, to describe isolated events rather than connected movements, and to speak generally of local features, without such marks as might serve to identify them.

Hence it is that neither can German research reach certainty as to the sites of the Teutoburgensis Saltus or Idistaviso; nor will Englishmen ever satisfy themselves as to the locality of the last heroic struggles of Caractacus or Boudicca. Algerian students, if such there ever should be, will find themselves perhaps still more bewildered in the attempt to represent geographically the advances and retreats of Tacfarinas.

H. FURNEAUX.

De Artium Scriptoris Latinis. Scripsit FELIX BOELTE. Bonn. University Press. 1886. 1 Mk.

It is generally recognised by all scholars who have given any attention to the subject that a large amount of the grammatical treatises comprised in the *Corpus Grammaticorum Latinorum*, and now printed in Keil's edition, is a mere repetition of identical matter, which must in the long run be referred back to a few, probably a very few, common sources. The questions for criticism to settle are: (1) what these authorities were; (2) how far was their form modified in the process of redaction and repetition.

For that some considerable modifications took place is clear. It is not uncommon to find, in the various *Artes*, short passages of identical sense repeated with some slight variation of form; and long passages

treating twice, or oftener, of the same subject in successive paragraphs. Charisius indeed tells us in his preface that his studies have been *ex variis artibus inrigata*, and lets us generally see pretty plainly, in the course of his work, how it was composed. But even in Diomedes and Priscian, whose arrangement is far more lucid and logical than that of Charisius, the same phenomenon is visible. I would suggest that it is partly due to the fact that these *Artes* were originally composed as lectures, for the purpose of oral instruction. The quantity of such manuals doubtless increased as time went on, until by the fourth and fifth century A.D. they were tolerably numerous. Each *magister* would probably take some one manual as his basis, and add illustrations, fresh information, and statements of differing views, from other manuals or works of reference. Thus the lectures, in this imperfect form, would be put together and published as a book. Diomedes seems to imply something of the sort when he says to his friend Athanasius in his preface that his *ars merae Latinitatis* is *trino digesta libello . . . quia ipsos aurium meatus audita scientia complere absentia denegatum est*. The fragment of Donatianus, printed in Keil, vol. vi. p. 275, begins, *Ars grammatica accepta ex auditorio Donatiani*. And the commentaries on Donatus by Pompeius, Servius, and Sergius leave the same impression still more clearly, when, as they not unfrequently do, they add to the text of Donatus remarks from the older writers such as Pliny and Scaurus.

It is doubtful whether any really original *Ars Grammatica* was composed in Latin after that of Terentius Scaurus in the reign of Hadrian; and to assume that this was to any great extent original may be going too far. Scaurus had been preceded by Remmius Palaemon in the reign of Claudius and Nero. There was a great deal, indeed, of critical and lexicographical work done in the first and early second centuries, such as the collections of Valerius Probus, Pliny's book *Dubii Sermonis*, the commentaries of Caper, Asper, and the *Stromateus* of Caesellius Vindex. Scaurus may well have used much of the materials collected in these works. That his was the last really important *Ars Grammatica*, and that those which follow are mere variations and abridgments, seems to be shown by the fact that very few quotations indeed occur in the Latin grammarians later than Juvenal and Suetonius.

Dr. Boelte's essay examines in a very thorough way five treatises—those of Charisius, Diomedes, Donatus, Dositheus, and the *Excerpta Charisii* (or *Anonymus Bobiensis*). Starting from the undeniable fact that large parts of these treatises really represent one and the same work, Dr. Boelte sets himself to find out what this work was, and in what form it was known to the writers whom he is considering. After a careful and conscientious examination, a large part of which I have tested by verifying his references, he comes to the conclusion that the common source was a manual whose author's name has been lost. The author probably lived some two generations before Aelius Donatus; that is, at the end of the third century A.D., or thereabouts.

In the section on the Noun, however, there is a marked resemblance on the one hand between Charisius, the *Anonymus Bobiensis*, and Dositheus, and on the other between Diomedes and Donatus. The inference is that there were two recensions of the original manual, one of which was used by the first three writers just named, and the other by the two last.

In all the other sections, where Diomedes and Donatus agree, the same work is their common

authority; and parts of the other three treatises can be also referred to it, though the question here becomes more intricate.

The original work in question cannot have come either from Palaemon or Scaurus or Cominianus. But where its author and Cominianus agreed, their agreement is to be accounted for by their use of the same authorities.

Dr. Boelte's general conclusion seems to me to be fairly made out both on its positive and on its negative side. That the passages in which these five treatises are virtually identical are derived from one source is quite clear: that no known writer, not Scaurus, or Palaemon, or Cominianus, is the author of this treatise seems equally clear. Certainly not Cominianus, for according to Charisius' repeated statements, he was a brief writer: certainly briefer than we must suppose the author of our (now) anonymous grammar to have been. And about the *Artes* of Palaemon and Scaurus we know too little to say with certainty to what exact extent they served as the bases of later manuals.

As is natural in such a case, I feel inclined to differ from Dr. Boelte on some points of detail. But students of this obscure corner of Latin literature will undoubtedly derive much assistance from his essay. It is to be hoped that he may pursue his investigations further with equal industry and success.—H. NETTLESHIP.

General Karte des Königreichs Griechenland, bearbeitet und herausgegeben vom K. K. Militärgeographischen Institute in Wien.

THE map published in 1852 by the French military survey has hitherto been the chief authority for the topography of Greece. The Vienna map, though on a smaller scale (1: 300,000) is so much superior in clearness and in the amount of information given, that it must take the first place. It is an admirable specimen of the best German workmanship. The mountains are marked in great detail with brown hatchings; the principal heights are marked in metres; the outlines are at once elaborate and distinct. The survey of Macedonia and northern Epirus is unfortunately only partial. The map gives the towns, rivers, and roads, but no mountains. But even thus it adds to our information. Not only is it one of the few maps which give the course of the Haliacmon correctly: it gives quite a new view of the rivers and lakes of north-western Macedonia (Malik See, Presba See, &c.), and assigns a very different outline and proportions to the lake of Joannina (Dodona). The mountains of Aetolia and Arcadia have also gained much by revision. All modern roads, bridlepaths, and footpaths, are carefully marked, so that the map is invaluable to travellers. But will it be of much use to scholars? The answer is both yes and no. Those who have plenty of time and an eye for maps can extract from it a great deal of information. But to a casual observer it gives no distinct impression at all. There is so little level ground in Greece that the practice of marking every hill makes it impossible to distinguish relative heights. Until you look at the number of metres marked upon a given hill it is almost impossible to guess whether its height is 500 feet or 5,000. Consequently the map gives no idea that Pindus, for instance, is a great barrier. It looks no more formidable than Oneium.

The praiseworthy desire to give information about roads has also interfered with clearness. Rivers and bridlepaths are only distinguishable by the superior straightness of the latter. Footpaths and the two kinds of boundaries also interfere with each other.

And rivers, roads, and boundaries, are continually broken by gaps for names to come across them. The river Inachos is thus broken ten times in as many miles, and never gets to the sea at all. This is specially unfortunate in a country where so many rivers go underground. The reader is continually suspecting *barathra*, only to find that his river has been engulphed in the name of a village.

The map is entirely modern. The lakes of Pheneus and Stymphalus, for instance, have their full modern extent, and the Peneius (Elis) its modern course. But in a large number of cases the ancient names of mountains and rivers are given in a different type. There are so many that one wonders why Maenalus and Thaumasion do not appear. And it is difficult to see why a courtesy extended to ancient mountains and rivers should be almost entirely denied to ancient towns.—M. G. GLAZEBROOK.

Akarnanien, Ambrakia, Amphilochien, Leukas, im Alterthum, von Dr. EUGEN OBERHUMMER, München, 1887. 10 Mk.

THE bulk of this book is historical. Dr. Oberhammer has, with immense industry, collected not only all references to Acaernania in the classics, but a great deal of information derived from coins and inscriptions. The result is a fairly consecutive account of the relations of Acaernania to other countries. It is likely to be very useful as a book of reference, but has only that kind of interest which attaches to the attempts to write the lives of Shakespeare's minor characters. Our author has patiently sought out all traits that could give individuality to the little country which he has taken under his protection. We find accounts of hunting, trade, arts and science, which read much like the chapter on snakes in Iceland. Under the heading of philosophy, for instance, we find that Acaernania claims that Cleombrotus, who after reading the Phaedo threw himself into the sea, in order to settle in his own mind the question of immortality. More solid are the geographical introduction and appendix. They supply a useful catalogue of places which have been identified, and of the references to them in classical writers. The author has visited Acaernania, and is able to make some small corrections in the existing maps. The only change of importance which he proposes is that already suggested by Henzey, to transfer Sollium to a point a few miles inland to the west of the bay of Tavarra. The evidence which he offers for this seems very insufficient; but so is the evidence for placing it on the east of the same bay.—M. G. GLAZEBROOK.

Passages for Translation into Latin Prose. With an introduction by H. NETTLESHIP, M.A., Corpus Professor of Latin in the University of Oxford. Bell & Sons. 1887. 3s.

PROFESSOR NETTLESHIP's book consists of sixty-three pieces for translation into Latin Prose, selected from various authors from Bacon to the late Rector of Lincoln. To this is prefixed an introduction in four parts, dealing with (1) the Latin representatives of some common English words expressing political and social ideas; (2) the range of metaphorical expression in Latin; (3) the development of classical style in Latin Prose; (4) cautions as to orthography. The first two parts necessarily cover only a small portion of the ground, and it is to be wished that Professor Nettleship could be prevailed upon to treat the subjects at greater length in a larger work. Some book is much wanted which would do for English what Nägelsbach's *Stilistik* does for German. The third part gives in a handy form lengthy quotations from

the fragments of Cato, C. Gracchus, Crassus the orator, etc., besides typical passages to illustrate the style of Cicero, Sallust, Livy and Tacitus. These quotations may, perhaps, prove valuable to teachers. There is a curious resemblance in some respects between the style of Cato and the style of the school-boy of to-day in the highest form of our public schools. If a boy can be made to see by an actual comparison of passages that his style in Latin is at least as far removed from Professor Nettleship's as Cato's from Cicero's, and what is more difficult, why this is

the case, we believe that a considerable difficulty will have been surmounted. Professor Nettleship's Latin versions are, as was to be expected, worthy of his reputation as a scholar; but in the matter of vocabulary and construction he shows a catholic taste, and certainly holds that salvation may be found in Quintilian as well as in Cicero. It is a pity that the proofs of the introduction have not been more carefully revised, as the book is disfigured by several bad misprints.—C. C.

NOTES.

ἀστούς and αὐτούς.—Cobet (*Variae Lectiones*, ed. 2, p. 283) quotes undeniable instances of confusion between these words. I should like to add two other passages, in which well-known difficulties may be easily removed by assuming the same confusion.

(1) Dem. *Phil.* I. § 36:

καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐμβαίνειν τοὺς μετοίκους ἔδοξε καὶ τοὺς χωρὶς οἰκούντας, εἰτ' αὐτοὺς πάλιν ἀντεμβιάζειν.

In our hurry and vacillation 'we first resolve that the resident aliens and freemen shall embark, and then again we determine—'; the rest is untranslatable. 'To put ourselves on board instead' has been half-heartedly given as a rendering; but how can αὐτοὺς be a reflexive (for ἡμᾶς αὐτούς)? And would such a turn of expression be in any case a likely one, when he might easily have said εἰτ' αὐτοὺς ἀντεμβαίνειν?

Westermann gives εἰτ' αὐτοὺς πάλιν, εἰτ' ἀντεμβιάζειν (absolutely, 'to change the crews').

Far better criticism I believe would be shewn in reading ἀστούς. 'First the freemen and resident aliens, and then citizens.' ἀστούς is of course the proper term in opposition to μετοίκους.

(2) Aristophanes, *Eg.* 258–263:

ἐν δίκῃ γ', ἐπεὶ τὰ κοινὰ πρὶν λαχεῖν κατεσθλείς,
καποσυκάσεις πύζων τοὺς ὑπεύθυνους σκοπῶν
ὅστις αὐτῶν ὧμὸς ἐστὶν ἢ πέπων ἢ μὴ πέπων,
κἂν τιν' αὐτῶν γνῆς ἀπράγμων' ὄντα καὶ κεχρηότα,
καταγαγὼν ἐκ Χερροήσου, διαλαβὼν, ἀγκυρίσας,
εἰτ' ἀποστρέψας τὸν ὄμον αὐτὸν ἐνεκολήθασας.

Here is a grievous change of metaphor at v. 261,—from pulling figs to wrestling. To avoid recognising this change editors have attempted very far-fetched explanations of ἀγκυρίσας, ἀποστρέψας τὸν ὄμον, and ἐνεκολήθασας.

But there is a far more important difficulty which has been strangely overlooked. αὐτῶν of v. 261 refers of course to the ὑπεύθυνοι. But the term ὑπεύθυνοι implies previous tenure of office at or from Athens. How then can one of these office-holders be called ἀπράγμων and belong to the Chersonese? An ἀπράγμων is ὁ μὴδὲν τῶν πολιτικῶν μετέχων (cf. Thucyd. ii. 40). Such a person cannot be ὑπεύθυνος.

Reading (in v. 261) ἀστών for αὐτῶν, we have Cleon's two sources of plunder, viz.:

(a) From the ὑπεύθυνοι at Athens.

(b) From quiet unsophisticated citizens (ἀστών) whom he blackmails—some countrified colonial in his cleruchy away in Chersonesos. He can easily give such persons a fall.—T. G. TUCKER.

ON THE MEANING OF ἀρετή.—The word ἀρετή occurs thrice in Homer, and is not quoted again by Stephanus from any author of the classical period.

The meaning always given to it both by ancient and modern interpreters is that of *threatening*, but this is in reality based on only one of the three passages in Homer, *T.* 109: λευγαλέοις ἐπέσσειν ἀποτρεπέτω καὶ ἀρεῖ. Certainly no such sinister meaning would ever have been given to ἀρετή had it only occurred in the other two passages. They are *P.* 431: πολλὰ δὲ μελιχίοισι προσήδα, πολλὰ δ' ἀρεῖ, and *Φ.* 339: μελιχίοις ἐπέσσειν ἀποτρεπέτω καὶ ἀρεῖ. In both of these ἀρετή is associated with 'gentle words,' and it is on the face of it far better to translate it 'prayer' than 'cursing,' and to derive it from ἀρή in the former sense. (It is true that ἀρή = *prayer* is always a spondee in Homer, but the change in the quantity proves nothing; possibly this misled the interpolator of the beginning of *T.* and helped to allure after him the host of Homeric commentators).

Is the remaining line, then, *T.* 109, of sufficient authority to overthrow the inference naturally drawn from the use of this word in the other two places? Surely not. I need not here give any proofs of the late origin of the opening of *T.*, the introduction to the notorious 'Second Theomachy'; they will be given, it may be presumed, abundantly in Mr. Leaf's second volume. I will only observe that the interpolator has in this line mistaken the meaning of another word as well, and that without any possible excuse; λευγαλέος cannot mean *terrible*, but only *mean*, *pitiful*; 'nunc asper, atrox' says Heyne rightly, but the dictionaries I have looked at are as unsatisfactory here as on ἀρετή. Indeed Liddell and Scott appear to have been puzzled about ἀρετή, as they only quote the line λευγαλέοις κ.τ.λ., saying 'cf.' the others (their references have got wrong), as though the other two were inconclusive as to the meaning.—ARTHUR PLATT.

PHILOSTRATUS, *Vita Apollonii*, i. 24.

καὶ τὰ γράμματα Ἑλλήνων μὲν, ἀλλ' οὕτω ταῦτα ἰδεῖν φασί.

Philostratus is speaking of the Eretrians who had been transplanted to a certain district; they used Greek characters, and their ancient tombs had Greek inscriptions on them. 'But,' according to the received reading, 'they say (i.e. Apollonius and Damis say) that they did not see these.' This makes the μὲν after Ἑλλήνων utterly meaningless, and besides why did they not see them as they were there? Read ταῦτα and translate: 'the characters were Greek indeed, but not the same to look upon.' This is just what we should expect, for these Eretrians had been there ἐν ταῖς πεντακόσιας, and the characters in question would either be Euboean of 500 years before or would have changed in a different manner from the other Greek alphabets, being entirely cut

off from them; in either case they would appear strange to Greeks of the time of Apollonius.

There remains the difficulty that *οὐκ* on this view must mean nothing more than *οὐ*. But (a) this is also the case with the old reading, (β) Philostratus regularly uses *οὐκ* in this way. Cf. *Vita Apoll.* ii. 2: τὸ τῆς Μυκάλης ὕψος *οὐκ* μέγα, ii. 8: δ ποταμὸς *οὐκ* μέγας, ii. 12, *ad fin.*: *οὐκ* λέγοντες, ii. 15: *οὐκ* τεκμαίρεσθαι παρῆχον *ἀν.* iii. 48: πέτονται *οὐκ* μέγα, iv. 16: μνησιν *οὐκ* ἀξίῳ (where you would rather expect *οὐκέτι*), v. 41: ἄλλα [ἔξια] *οὐκ* τῆς ἐπὶ τοσούτῃ δόξης,¹ vi. 9: *οὐκ* με ἤξιον, vi. 27: *οὐκ* μὲν ἑώρατο, vii. 3: *οὐκ* ἀξιάλογα, vii. 28: *οὐκ* μεγάλα. Many other instances might easily be adduced, but these are the clearest I have observed; any one who will look at the passages in their context will be satisfied.

This use of *οὐκ* is indeed Homeric: see Leaf on *Iliad* iii. 306. I remember to have encountered some strange lucubrations arising from ignorance of this on the line in the *Odyssey*: οὐ γὰρ πῶ πάντες αἱ θεοὶ φαίνονται ἐναργεῖς.

Philostratus, *Vita Apollonii*, iv. 7.

χρυσὴ πλεῖον τοῦ * ὄντος.

'Aliquid excidisse ante ὄντος significavi.' Kayser. Read τοῦ δέοντος which gives the meaning wanted. Possibly τοῦ δέοντος was corrupted into τοῦ δὲ ὄντος and the δὲ then omitted. δέον has fallen out bodily in *Zosimus* iii. 15 and been restored by modern editors: φέτο γὰρ [δὲν] μὴ περὶ μικρὰ διατρέβειν.

ARTHUR PLATT.

In his *Evangelium Palatinum* p. xxi. Tischendorf professes himself puzzled by a curious interpolation in Luke xxiv. 11. The text of Cod. Palatinus (which, like other Latin mss., omits v. 12) runs thus:—

et ceterae
quae cum ipsis
fuerant haec
dicebant ad
apostolos et
visa sunt an
te illos sicut de
leramentum (*sic*)
verba ista et

Non crede
bant illis LXX
VIII fuerunt
autem duo ex
illis euntes ip
sa die in castel
lum &c.

Tischendorf remarks that the number LXXVIII is not likely to have arisen from any confusion with *Capitula* or *Canons*. Is it not possible that it rather stands for LXX VIRI, with reference to the tradition that both Cleopas and his companion were of the number of the Seventy (Cyril Alex.)? The gloss would then be introduced to explain *ex illis*, two lines below, which might otherwise seem to have for its antecedent *ad apostolos*. It would be quite in the manner of the Latin scribes to identify *πᾶσι τοῖς λοιποῖς* in v. 9. with the numerically definite body next in order to the Apostles.—W. SANDAY.

TWO MSS. AT PATMOS. I. *Macarius Chryscephalus*, a writer probably of the 14th century, compiled a Catena on S. Matthew, which is of value for the extracts which it contains from early Greek

¹ It is conceivable that Philostratus wrote ἄλλα τῆς δόξης for 'other pretexs not sufficient to excite such anger,' but it is a great deal more likely that he wrote ἄλλα ἔξια *οὐκ* κ.τ.λ. and that the ἔξια fell out, as it easily might after ἄλλα.

Fathers. The work was in three books, each of which comprised twenty λόγοι. Hitherto, as far as I am aware, only the first book has been known to us. It lies, still unedited I believe, in the Bodleian Library (Cod. Barocc. 156, dated 1845 A.D.). When I was going to Patmos in the Easter vacation of this year to collate a MS. of the Philocalia of Origen, it was suggested to me by Dr. Hort that possibly a MS. which bore the name of Macarius might contain further portions of this work. This has proved to be the case. Codex 381 in the Monasterial Library contains the second book (S. Matt. viii. 5—xvii. 13). The first λόγος is entitled περὶ τοῦ ἱκατοντάρχου, and the twentieth ἡ μεταμόρφωσις τοῦ Χριστοῦ. The MS. was written in 1349, and has at the close some verses to Jeremiah on whose day (May 1) it was completed. It consists of 385 leaves, and contains passages from the following authors: Amphilochius, Andreas Cretensis, Asterius, Athanasius, Basilus, Chrysostomus, Clemens Alex., Climacus, Cosmas, Cyrillus, Joh. Damascenus, Dionysius, Elias Cretensis, Ephraem, Epiphanius, Esaias Monachus, Eusebius, Gregorius Naz., Gregorius Nysa, Isak Monachus, Isidorus, Marcus Monachus, Maximus, Methodius, Nicetas, Origenes, Symeon, Theophanes, Theophylactus, Zonaras.

2. The *Uncial Catena on Job* in the library at Patmos is probably the oldest representative of a large family of illustrated Catenaes on this book. Its age is difficult to fix, but it is no doubt older than any of the cursives mentioned below. Hitherto those who have examined it have merely stated that it differed considerably from that published by Patrick Young—the Catena of Nicetas, which was also printed in Venice in 1792. It is indeed a wholly different work, though drawn to a great extent from the same sources. The Origen extracts correspond generally to those given by Gallicolus in the appendix to Gallandius, which are taken according to Morelli from the Venice MS. Marcian. xxi. These extracts are also found with considerable variants in three MSS. in the Bodleian:

Laudian. 30, saec. xii
Laudian. 20, saec. xiii
Miscell. 44, saec. xiii

None of these however has been copied from the Patmos MS. Indeed they diverge not only from it but from one another. The transcribers of these Catenaes seem to have allowed themselves large license of curtailment and transposition: but notwithstanding this they still form a distinct group as contrasted with the Catena of Nicetas. Laudian. 20 and Miscell. 44 have no prefatory matter. Laudian. 20 begins with the short dissertation of Polychronius on the obscurity of Scripture, and has other prefaces besides. Judging from the catalogues I should expect that this last would correspond closely with

Paris, Coisl. exciv, saec. circ. xiii. (from Mt. Athos).
Florence, Laur. Plut. x Cod. xxix, saec. xiii.

Both of these contain the same dissertation of Polychronius. The study of Catenaes is uninviting and laborious, and not always very promising. But future editors of Origen's exegetical remains will have to reckon with the Patmos Macarius and the Patmos Job; and I envy them at any rate the cordial welcome and the genial hospitality of the Monks of S. John.—J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON.

CLASSICAL EDUCATION IN FRANCE.

(Letter from a French University Professor.)

III.

Les établissements d'enseignement supérieur où, à côté d'autres études très diverses, les études classiques se poursuivent, sont : à Paris, l'École normale supérieure ; l'École pratique des hautes études ; le Collège de France ; la Faculté des lettres (à la Sorbonne) ; en province, quinze Facultés des lettres et une École supérieure (à Alger). Enfin, il faut nommer encore, bien qu'il ne s'y fasse pas d'enseignement à proprement parler, les Écoles françaises de Rome et d'Athènes. Tous ces établissements sont à la charge de l'État et sous la direction du ministre de l'Instruction publique. L'initiative privée n'a créé que fort peu de chose dans ce domaine. Quelques facultés catholiques peu prospères, malgré des débuts assez brillants, c'est tout ce qu'on peut mentionner.

Les élèves de l'École normale sont internes. Ils y entrent à la suite d'un concours. Ils y passent trois ans. Ils sont entièrement défrayés par l'État, et prennent, en retour, l'engagement de faire dix ans de service dans les établissements de l'État. Des conférences leur sont faites à l'École par des maîtres spéciaux ; en outre, ils peuvent suivre ailleurs des cours de leur choix. Ils ont à leur disposition, dans l'École, une très belle bibliothèque. Ils travaillent ou seuls ou par petits groupes, et sont personnellement guidés, conseillés, aiguillonnés par le directeur et le sous-directeur de la section des lettres, qui habitent au milieu d'eux. Ils sont soutenus en outre par une tradition qui se perpétue depuis près d'un siècle et par un esprit de corps qui se conserve chez chacun d'eux la vie durant. Triés au concours parmi les élèves les plus distingués de l'enseignement secondaire, entourés pendant trois ans des soins assidus de maîtres éminents, profitant sans aucun souci matériel de toutes les ressources intellectuelles d'une ville telle que Paris, astreints au travail par l'internement et stimulés par une sorte d'amour-propre collectif, affinant, polissant leur esprit par le frottement réciproque autant peut-être que par l'étude des livres et le commerce des professeurs, on comprend que ces jeunes gens acquièrent à bien des égards une supériorité dont ils se montrent justement fiers, et que ces mots d'ancien élève de l'École normale soient à eux seuls un titre dont on se prévaut volontiers même après avoir acquis une notoriété personnelle. C'est en général à la fin de la première année qu'on se présente à l'examen pour la licence ès lettres, et après les trois ans au concours d'agrégation. Nécessairement les études de la première et de la troisième année se font sous l'empire des préoccupations que donne la perspective de ces épreuves ; celles de la seconde année sont plus libres et bien des élèves savent faire un excellent usage de cette liberté. Mais le but de l'École étant de recruter le personnel enseignant des lycées, les études doivent être professionnelles, comme on dit ; elles doivent être faites de manière à former une élite de professeurs de l'enseignement secondaire ; elles doivent viser à assurer le succès des élèves aux examens. En conséquence on étudie les auteurs portés aux programmes de la licence et de l'agrégation ; on fait les exercices sur lesquels portent les épreuves à subir, dissertations françaises et latines, thèmes grecs, versions, compositions de grammaire, leçons sur des sujets donnés, etc. Pendant la troisième année, les élèves sont divisés en deux sections, la section de grammaire et celle de littérature, suivant

qu'ils aspirent à être placés un jour, comme professeurs au lycée, dans la division élémentaire ou supérieure. Enfin pendant leur séjour à l'École ils sont appelés chacun pour quelque temps à faire un petit apprentissage pratique en suppléant un professeur de lycée dans sa classe.

L'École des hautes études peut se comparer aux séminaires des universités allemandes, à l'imitation desquels elle a été fondée. Elle n'admet que des élèves sérieux, assidus, qui prennent part aux travaux des conférences. Elle ne leur demande ni d'où ils viennent ni où ils vont ; elle n'exige aucun certificat à l'entrée et ne prétend préparer à aucun carrière ; elle s'assure seulement qu'on est capable de suivre les cours auxquels on s'inscrit, et confère un diplôme qui n'a aucune valeur pratique. Elle n'est limitée ou contrainte, ni dans le choix des objets à étudier ni dans la manière de diriger ses exercices, par aucune considération de succès aux examens. Elle jouit de la plus entière et véritable liberté d'enseignement. Elle a des maîtres de premier ordre, en partie formés par elle-même. Ils font des conférences plutôt que des cours ; ils travaillent en commun avec leurs élèves, pour leur apprendre à travailler comme eux à l'avancement de la science, non pour leur transmettre une science toute faite. Les exercices portent sur la grammaire grecque et latine, la critique et l'interprétation des textes, la métrique, l'épigraphie, la paléographie, etc., mais sans suivre toujours un ordre systématique. L'École des hautes études a des élèves qui la considèrent comme leur vrai centre, sans s'interdire, bien entendu, de profiter des autres ressources du Paris érudit. En outre, tout ce à quelque goût pour la science pure, dans l'ordre des études classiques, à la Sorbonne et ailleurs, ne manque pas de pénétrer au moins temporairement dans ce sanctuaire de la philologie.

Le Collège de France n'est pas moins libre que l'École des hautes études. Les études classiques y sont représentées par une chaire de littérature grecque, et une de littérature latine, une de philologie latine, deux d'épigraphie et d'antiquités grecques et latines, une de philologie comparée, etc. Chaque professeur choisit à son gré la forme du grand cours ou de la conférence familière ; plusieurs font tour à tour l'un et l'autre. Chacun est libre de traiter les sujets qu'il veut, et de s'adresser au public qui lui convient. Aucun examen, ni d'entrée ni de sortie. Les professeurs eux-mêmes sont nommés sans autres titres que leur valeur scientifique, estimée par leurs futurs collègues et par l'Institut. Les cours relatifs à l'antiquité classique sont suivis par des étudiants de la Faculté des lettres, mais dans une ville comme Paris il y a assez d'autres éléments pour former un auditoire, et les professeurs du Collège de France ne sont nullement obligés de ménager les intérêts particuliers d'auditeurs menacés d'un examen à la fin de l'année.

Il n'en est pas de même des Facultés des lettres. Leurs élèves sont soit boursiers de l'État, soit maîtres répétiteurs ou maîtres auxiliaires des lycées, soit enfin étudiants libres. Mais la plupart ont pris le même engagement décennal que les élèves de l'École normale ; presque tous se destinent à l'enseignement et doivent, pour pouvoir être placés dans les collèges et lycées, obtenir les titres de licenciés et d'agrégés. Ils sont donc astreints à préparer des examens, à travailler d'après un programme, comme les élèves de l'École normale ; chaque faculté renferme dans son

sein comme une petite école normale. Il faut que les élèves fassent dans le courant de l'année un certain nombre de dissertations, de thèmes, de versions, etc., afin de pouvoir subir avec succès les épreuves écrites des examens. Il faut qu'ils étudient les ouvrages d'auteurs français, latins et grecs, sur lesquels ils seront examinés. Enfin les candidats à l'agrégation doivent s'exercer à faire des leçons sur des sujets donnés. Les professeurs de faculté sont tenus de diriger ces exercices et de corriger ces différentes compositions, et naturellement ils choisissent, pour les traiter dans leurs cours, les sujets dont la majorité des étudiants doivent s'occuper en vue de leurs examens. Il en résulte que certains cours s'adressent plus particulièrement aux candidats à la licence, d'autres aux candidats à l'agrégation; beaucoup aussi servent à tous également; plusieurs enfin sont faits à la fois pour les étudiants et pour le public de la ville. Il y a généralement à chaque faculté un cours d'histoire de chacune des littératures, française, latine et grecque; un cours de grammaire latine et un de grammaire grecque; un autre de grammaire française historique; un cours ou des exercices de métrique; un cours sur les institutions grecques et romaines; enfin des leçons assez nombreuses consacrées à l'explication des auteurs, que le professeur tantôt fait lui-même, tantôt fait faire à ses élèves en les dirigeant et les corrigeant. Voici, pour vous donner une idée des auteurs qu'on étudie dans les facultés, les programmes de licence (trisannuel) de 1887 à 1889, et d'agrégation (annuels) de 1886 à 1887.

Licence en lettres.—*Chanson de Roland*, 2164 à 2396. Joinville, *Saint Louis*, ch. 32 à 46. Montaigne, *Des Livres*. Corneille, *Polyeucte*, *Nicomède*. La Fontaine, *Fables*, l. vii. et viii. La Rochefoucauld, *Maximes*. Molière, *Les Précieuses Ridicules*, *Tartuffe*. Pascal, *Pensées*, art. 7 et 8. Bossuet, *Sermons sur l'Honneur du Monde et sur la Mort*. Boileau, *Art poétique*, l. i. et iii. Racine, *Britannicus*. La Bruyère, *Les ouvrages de l'esprit*. Voltaire, *Choix de lettres*. Térence, *Les Adelphes*. Lucrèce, l. i. 1 à 700. Virgile, *Georgiques*, l. i.; *Enéide*, viii. et ix. Horace, *Odes*, iii.; *Épîtres*, ii.; *Art poétique*. Cicéron, *pro Archia*; *ad Q. f. i. 1*; *de finibus*, l. i. T. Live, xxi.; Tacite, *Histoires*, ii. Quintilien, x. 1. Homère, *Odyssée*, xi. Pindare, *Pythique* 4. Sophocle, *Oedipe roi*. Aristophane, *Les Nuées*, 1 à 1104. Hérodote, viii. 71 à 144. Thucydide, vii. 62 à 87. Platon, *Phédon*, 1 à 34. Démosthène, *Olynthiennes*, i. et ii. Théocrite, *Les Syracusaines*.

Agrégation des lettres.—Corneille, *Polyeucte*. Rotrou, *Saint Genest*. Racine, *Phédre*. Molière, *Critique de l'École des femmes*; *Impromptu*. Boileau, *Épîtres*, 1 et 5 à 11. Montaigne, *Essais*, iii. 8 et 9. Bossuet, *Discours sur l'Histoire universelle*, iii. 5 à 8. *Sermons sur la Providence et sur la Pensée de la Mort*. Bourdaloue, *Sermons sur les mêmes sujets*. Montesquieu, *Grandeur et Décadence*, 13 à 19. Virgile, *Enéide*, vi. Horace, *Épîtres*, ii. 1 et 2. Ovide, *Fastes*, l. Lucain, vii. 1 à 711. Cicéron, *de officiis*, iii.; *pro Archia*; *pro Roscio comoedo*. César, *Guerre Civile*, iii. 80 à 112. T. Live, xl. 1 à 24 et 54 à 59. Tacite, *Dialogue*. Homère, *Odyssée*, xi. Sophocle, *Oedipe roi*. Euripide, *Médée*. Apollonius, *Argonautiques*, iii. 609 à 1162. Théocrite, *Les Syracusaines*. Thucydide, vii. 42 à 87. Platon, *Phédon*, 1 à 34. Démosthène, *Sur l'Ambassade*, 177 à 343.

Agrégation de grammaire.—*Chanson de Roland*, 603 à 803. Constans, *Chrestomathie, Serments de Strasbourg*; *Prose de Sainte Eulalie*; *Amis et Amiles*; Villehardouin. Montaigne, ii. 10, et iii. 8. Corneille, *Polyeucte*. Racine, *Phédre*.

Molière, *Les Précieuses Ridicules*. Bossuet, *Discours sur l'Histoire Universelle*, iii. 5 à 8. Voltaire, *Lettres Choies de 1750 à 1760*. Virgile, *Enéide*, vi. Horace, *Épîtres*, ii. 1 et 2. Ovide, *Fastes*, l. César, *Guerre Civile*, iii. 80 à 112. Cicéron, *pro Archia*; *de officiis*, iii. T. Live, xxii. Tacite, *Dialogue*. Homère, *Odyssée*, xi. Sophocle, *Oedipe roi*. Euripide, *Médée*. Théocrite, *Les Syracusaines*. Thucydide, vii. 42 à 87. Démosthène, *Sur l'Ambassade*, 177 à 383. Plutarque, *Démosthène*.

Il est évident que ces ouvrages sont trop nombreux pour être tous expliqués à la faculté. Il faut que le professeur en choisisse quelques-uns, à propos desquels il montre le chemin, la méthode; aux étudiants de voir le reste entre eux ou chacun pour soi. De même en fait de grammaire, d'histoire littéraire, etc.; le cours, qui est d'une heure par semaine, ne peut embrasser plus que quelques chapitres de ces vastes matières. Une fois initié, l'étudiant doit compléter ses connaissances et développer ses aptitudes à l'aide de lectures et, en quelque mesure aussi, de recherches personnelles.

Ce dernier mot touche le point faible des études telles qu'elles se font actuellement dans les facultés des lettres. Les étudiants les plus capables et les plus avancés, ceux qui approchent des examens et surtout de l'agrégation, c'est à dire justement ceux qui seraient en état de s'élever à des études vraiment supérieures, ont à parcourir chaque année un programme aussi étendu que vous venez de le voir, et à fournir toute une série de devoirs d'écoliers, thèmes, versions, etc.; il est bien difficile qu'ils trouvent à côté de cela le temps et la force de se livrer à d'autres travaux plus personnels et propres à les initier aux investigations scientifiques. Il faudrait, pour que cela devint possible à tous ceux qui en auraient le goût transformer le concours en examen de capacité, ou tout au moins supprimer le programme annuel et remplacer les compositions dont j'ai parlé par des épreuves plus sérieuses. Pourtant, même dans l'état actuel, on a parfois la satisfaction de voir un étudiant collationner un manuscrit et en déterminer la valeur; corriger ou interpréter un texte désespéré; creuser un problème de grammaire ou d'histoire littéraire; mais ce sont forcément aujourd'hui des exceptions. Le temps et l'énergie de la majorité des étudiants sont absorbés par le travail imposé, et quelquefois bien terre à terre, de la préparation directe aux examens.

Pour être juste, il faut ajouter, que ce même système d'études a l'avantage d'empêcher qu'on se spécialise trop tôt, au détriment des connaissances générales, et de développer chez les étudiants des qualités précieuses pour l'accomplissement de leur future tâche. Soumis à cette espèce d'entraînement tout pratique, ils deviennent eux-mêmes habiles à faire les exercices qu'ils auront à diriger chez leurs élèves, et ils acquièrent l'art de la composition et le don d'exposer avec ordre, clarté et agrément.

On a beaucoup fait, depuis quelques années, pour créer et perfectionner les instruments de travail, manuels, dictionnaires, éditions d'auteurs, etc. En jetant un regard sur la bibliothèque de l'étudiant, vous vous ferez une idée de ce que sont ses études en dehors des cours.

M. S. Reinach a publié en 1880 un manuel embrassant tout l'ensemble des études classiques sous le titre de *Manuel de philologie classique*. C'était primitivement un résumé du *Triennium philologicum* de W. Freund, mais qui a subi des modifications importantes et s'est fort élargi en deuxième édition. L'auteur a accumulé dans deux volumes une quantité immense de faits et de noms propres (pas tous également sûrs, naturellement), sans qu'il en résulte

aucune sécheresse ; au contraire, son livre est d'une lecture attrayante, et ne peut qu'inspirer le désir d'approfondir les innombrables sujets d'études qui y sont effleurés. Les différentes branches de la vaste science esquissée par M. Reinach ont aussi leurs manuels, dont plusieurs traduits de l'allemand, comme Ottfried Mueller, *Histoire de la Littérature grecque* ; Teuffel, *Histoire de la Littérature latine* ; Curtius, *Grammaire grecque* ; Madvig, *Grammaire latine*, et *Syntaxe grecque* ; Buecheler, *Déclinaison latine* ; Guhl et Koner, *Vie privée des Anciens* ; Friedlaender, *Mœurs romaines* ; Preller, *Mythologie*, etc. ; puis une série de petits traités destinés proprement aux classes supérieures des lycées, mais plus souvent peut-être consultés à la faculté : Brambach, *Orthographe latine* (*Hilfsbüchlein*) ; L. Mueller, *Métrique grecque et latine* ; Schiller, *Mètres d'Horace* ; Seyffert et Bamberg, *Syntaxe grecque* ; Kraner, *L'Armée romaine* (tiré de l'introduction à son *César*) ; Berger, *Stylistique latine* ; Meissner, *Phraséologie latine* ; Bender, *Histoire de la Littérature latine* ; Mahaffy, *Archéologie grecque* (traduit de l'anglais), etc. Parmi les ouvrages écrits en français, les étudiants s'en tiennent aussi trop volontiers à ceux qui sont destinés plutôt à des écoliers, Pierron, Nageotte ou Deltour pour l'histoire des littératures, Chassang pour la grammaire, Robiou et Delaunay pour les Institutions, etc. Ces livres, dont quelques-uns ont des qualités incontestables, mais qui ne sont pas à la hauteur d'un enseignement vraiment supérieur, sont remplacés peu à peu par des traités plus complets et plus propres à servir à la fois de répertoires et d'introduction à des études personnelles. Pour les seules institutions romaines, il existe trois excellents ouvrages, auxquels vient de s'ajouter la traduction de Mommsen et Marquardt : Willems, *Le Droit public romain* ; Mispoulet, *Les Institutions politiques des Romains* ; et Bouché-Leclercq, *Manuel des Institutions romaines*. L'épigraphie grecque et romaine ont fait l'objet de deux publications estimables de MM. S. Reinach et R. Cagnat. MM. Alfred et Maurice Croiset ont entrepris d'écrire une nouvelle histoire de la littérature grecque, dont le premier volume, consacré à Homère et Hésiode, vient de paraître et fait très bien augurer de l'ensemble. La syntaxe latine a été traitée presque simultanément par MM. Antoine et Riemann, ce dernier plus original, l'autre plus complet et sur certains points plus clair. Le cours élémentaire de métrique grecque et latine de M. Louis Havet, remarquable par sa clarté, sa concision et sa précision, dispensera désormais de se servir de la petite métrique de L. Mueller, si peu digne de l'auteur du *de re metrica*. La mythologie grecque est représentée par le beau livre de M. Decharmé. Le *Dictionnaire des Antiquités* de Daremberg et Saglio, si bien rédigé et si abondamment illustré, offre une riche source d'informations ; malheureusement il paraît très lentement et en est encore aux premières lettres de l'alphabet. La *Paléographie des Classiques latins*, de M. Châtelain, est bien faite pour introduire à cette étude, si utile, si nécessaire, et pour en donner le goût. Nous manquons de bons dictionnaires grecs et latins, car celui de Freund traduit par Theil est trop cher pour les étudiants, et les autres sont par trop élémentaires. Le meilleur incontestablement est celui de Theil, mais il est beaucoup moins répandu que celui de Quicherat, qui est fort médiocre. Heureusement, on a confié à un savant très compétent, M. Châtelain, le soin de le refondre entièrement. Quant au *Thesaurus Poeticus* de Quicherat, c'est un ouvrage très soigné, très digne de confiance et fort utile, non pas seulement pour la versification. En fait de dictionnaires grecs, on a Alexandre et Chassang, l'un fort ancien, l'autre tout moderne, l'un et l'autre

très insuffisants. MM. Bréal et Bailly, sous le titre de *Dictionnaire Étymologique Latin*, ont donné un excellent supplément aux dictionnaires latins. Ils n'indiquent que les étymologies à peu près incontestables, avec des explications qui peuvent servir d'introduction à l'étude de la morphologie ; et ce qui est peut-être plus remarquable et non moins utile, c'est la déduction des différentes acceptions des mots, appuyée sur un heureux choix d'exemples. Je vous ai parlé des éditions d'auteurs anciens faites pour les classes. Il en existe aussi quelques-unes destinées à des lecteurs plus avancés et auxquelles les étudiants recourent volontiers, comme le *Sophocle* de M. Tournier, le *Démosthène* et l'*Euripide* de M. Weil, le *Virgile* de Benoist, les *Discours de Cicéron* de M. Thomas, etc.

A côté de ces livres, qui sont les livres à consulter, à feuilleter à tout propos, ou à étudier à fond, il faudrait citer une série de lectures très recommandées aux étudiants, et généralement goûtées par eux, telles que l'*Essai sur Tite-Live* de M. Taine ; Boissier, *Cicéron et ses amis* ; Martha, le *Poème de Lucrèce* ; Patin, les *Tragiques grecs* ; J. Girard, l'*Éloquence attique* ; Fustel de Coulanges, la *Cité antique*, etc., etc. Enfin, on cherche avec plus ou moins de succès à familiariser les étudiants avec les grandes collections savantes, avec les travaux spéciaux et de première main sur les auteurs qu'ils ont à expliquer et sur les questions d'histoire littéraire, d'antiquités, ou autres, qui peuvent se poser au cours de leurs travaux. Ces efforts rencontrent des obstacles de différente nature. D'abord, les auteurs portés aux programmes sont beaucoup trop nombreux pour qu'on puisse en faire une étude approfondie et prendre connaissance même des travaux les plus importants qui les concernent ; puis, la plupart des livres et des mémoires qu'il faudrait lire sont écrits en allemand, d'autres en anglais, et beaucoup d'étudiants ont de la peine à comprendre ces langues ; enfin, en province du moins, les bibliothèques sont encore bien pauvres et mal administrées, en sorte que, de douze ou quinze travaux spéciaux qu'on aurait à consulter sur telle question, on en aura, si tout va bien, deux ou trois à sa disposition au moment voulu.

Telles sont en France les ressources offertes à ceux qui se voient à l'étude de l'antiquité classique. J'ai dit que ce sont presque tous de futurs membres du corps enseignant. Il n'y a guère à côté d'eux qu'un nombre assez restreint d'étudiants en droit ou en théologie protestante, qui recherchent la licence ès lettres comme une recommandation dans leur carrière ou comme une ressource en cas de besoin. On compterait bien moins de personnes encore qui font ces études pour le seul plaisir de s'instruire. Ces personnes suivront plutôt des cours de sanscrit, d'arabe, de chinois, ou simplement d'histoire et de philosophie. Les études classiques—ce n'est peut-être pas un mal—sont laissées aux gens du métier. De ceux-ci beaucoup n'essaient pas de s'élever au-dessus de la licence. Une cinquantaine chaque année sont admis à l'agrégation. Les élèves de l'École normale y réussissent presque toujours, et tiennent le plus souvent la tête. On a vu cependant et l'on voit plus fréquemment d'année en année, les étudiants de la faculté de Paris, et même de certaines facultés de province, lutter avec eux victorieusement et arriver en nombre jusqu'aux premiers rangs. Les plus distingués des agrégés et quelques-uns qui passent à côté de l'agrégation pour aller droit au doctorat, deviennent parfois de vrais savants. Je n'en nommerai qu'un, parcequ'il est mort, hélas ! c'est Charles Graux. Vous connaissez ses travaux, et vous pouvez juger par lui de ce que nos écoles sont en état de produire.

Parmi ces jeunes gens de talent supérieur, quelques-uns sont désignés chaque année par les établissements qui les ont formés pour être envoyés à Rome ou à Athènes comme membres des écoles françaises de ces villes. Les années qu'on y passe sont le véritable couronnement des études classiques. C'est là que d'élève on devient maître. C'est là qu'on apprend à chercher, à découvrir, à faire la lumière. Il n'y a plus ni cours ni conférences à suivre. Chacun entreprend un travail pour lequel il reçoit les conseils et l'appui du directeur, mais qu'il accomplit librement et sous sa responsabilité propre. Ce sont tantôt des recherches faites dans les bibliothèques et les musées, tantôt des fouilles pratiquées dans le sol, tantôt des excursions ou des voyages d'exploration archéologique ou épigraphique. Ces travaux font l'objet de rapports annuels adressés à l'Institut. Le plus souvent aussi ils donnent lieu à des publications spéciales. Deux périodiques, le *Bulletin de Correspondance hellénique* et

les *Mélanges d'Archéologie et d'Histoire*, ont été créés pour recevoir celles de moindre dimension. D'autres, plus étendues, deviennent des thèses pour le doctorat, ou des fascicules de la *Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome*. On voit que ces écoles ne sont pas tant des écoles que des Instituts. Ce sont de petites corporations savantes, entretenues par la France dans les deux centres de l'ancien monde et chargées de travailler sur place à le faire revivre. Si on leur a donné cependant le nom d'écoles avec raison, c'est qu'une école est un lieu où l'on apprend, et qu'il n'est guère de lieu où l'on apprenne plus et mieux que là. C'est de Rome et d'Athènes que nous sont revenus, dans les jeunes générations, la plupart de ceux qui ont fait faire quelque progrès aux études grecques et latines, en particulier à l'archéologie et à l'épigraphie, qui y sont naturellement le plus en honneur.

UNIVERSITY INTELLIGENCE.

OXFORD.

DERBY SCHOLAR — G. R. Northcote, New (Winchester).

LINCOLN, *Professor Fellow*, P. Gardner, Ch. Coll. Camb., (City of London), Professor of Classical Archaeology.

MERTON, *Fellows* (Cl.), W. Ashburner, Balliol

(Univ. Coll. School); L. T. Hobhouse, C. C. C. (Marlborough).

NEW COLLEGE, *Fellow* (Nat. Sc.), G. C. Bourne, New (Eton).

TRINITY, *Australian Scholar*, H. S. R. Thornton (Harrow).

CAMBRIDGE.

Dr. Swainson, the late Master of Christ's and Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity, was best known to theologians by his studies on the Creeds and the materials he had collected for an edition of the Greek Liturgies. The new master (Dr. Peile) is Reader in Comparative Philology, and author of the *Introduction to Greek and Latin Etymology*. Dr. Hort has succeeded to the Lady Margaret Professorship.

It is proposed to send out Dr. Guillemard and Mr. H. B. Smith to commence archaeological explorations in Cyprus. The Worts Fund could not be better employed than in aiding this enterprise.

The introduction of the reformed pronunciation of Latin is authoritatively proclaimed, and lectures have been already given for the purpose of explaining and enforcing it.

The Heads of Houses will appoint, on Nov. 30, to the Disney chair of Archaeology, vacant by Dr.

Gardner's election at Oxford. We hear that Mr. Cecil Torr is likely to be a candidate.

TRINITY, *Fellows* (Math.), W. F. Sheppard, B.A. (Charterhouse); W. P. Workman, B.A. (Kingswood).

CHARE, *Scholar* (Math.), H. M. Macdonald (Aberdeen).

CAIUS, *Sen. Fellows* (Math.), J. W. Sharpe (Derby); *Fellow* (Nat. Sc.), C. S. Sherrington (Ipswich); *Scholars* (Mod. and Mediaev. Lang. and Lit.), E. L. Milner-Bury; W. Kippmann (Dulwich).

ST. CATHERINE'S, *Scholars*, W. A. Crabtree (Canterbury); G. A. Anning (Cheltenham Grammar School); T. W. Morgan; H. E. Farrell (Vict. Coll., Douglas, Isle of Man).

JESUS, *Scholars* (Math.), S. G. W. Stephenson (Loughborough); (Hist.), C. N. Clapcott (Newton Abbot).

ARCHÆOLOGY.

HARROW SCHOOL MUSEUM.—(1) *Catalogue of the Egyptian antiquities from the collection of the late Sir Gardner Wilkinson*: by E. A. WALLIS BUDGE, M.A.

(2) *Catalogue of the Classical antiquities from the collection of the late Sir Gardner Wilkinson*: by CECIL TORR, M.A. Harrow, 1887. London: D. Nutt. 1s. each.

HARROW SCHOOL is fortunate in having found no less than three benefactors interested in its archaeo-

logical welfare. Sir Gardner Wilkinson many years ago transferred to Harrow School by gift during his lifetime, and by bequest on his death, a collection which comprises amongst other things two large series of Egyptian and classical antiquities; though not complete in themselves, these two series furnish excellent typical material for the study of Egyptian and Greek archaeology, and form a nucleus around which it is hoped a fuller gallery of illustration may in course of time be gathered.

These collections were for a long time stowed in the Vaughan library, and have now found a new home in the museum recently erected by the Governors. The conditions of the bequest provided that the collections 'should be placed as soon as possible in a suitable and convenient place belonging to the said Governors of Harrow School.' Yet at the beginning of this year absolutely nothing had been done for their proper exhibition. In view possibly of another stipulation 'that they be not dispersed,' the archaeological antiquities were huddled into two or three wall-cases, which they shared with fossils and other natural history specimens; this arrangement, however interesting from a natural history point of view, was hardly what Sir Gardner would have called 'suitable and convenient.'

After infinite trouble Mr. Cecil Torr succeeded in obtaining permission to take the collections in hand, and it is due to his energy and generosity that Harrow is now in a unique position as compared with other schools which have or have not a museum. The collections have been scientifically arranged, mounted, and exhibited, and the excellent catalogues above mentioned have been drawn up at the instance and expense of Mr. Torr.

These catalogues are modelled on a plan which is likely to initiate a new epoch in the study of archaeology in our public schools. The works of both Mr. Budge and Mr. Torr give us elaborate and careful catalogues which supply all that professed archaeologists are likely to require; but they are furthermore practical manuals of the subjects they deal with, calculated to interest and instruct even the most willfully ignorant in these subjects; and in this connection they will be most welcome in other schools beside Harrow. Mr. Budge, for example, with the abundant assistance of a beautifully clear hieroglyphic fount, makes his classification of scarabæi, Ushabti figures, deities, sacred animals, &c., and a short introduction to the study of each branch of his subject; while two very important lists are added, giving (pp. 6-8) the common phonetic, syllabic and determinative signs, and (pp. 87-104) the principal kings, with their cartouches and dates (after Brugsch) down to B.C. 358.

Mr. Torr's remarks have a similar value for the Greek vases, terracottas and bronzes: prefaced by a vigorous setting forth of the claims of archaeology as 'the only outcome of classical education (apart from the unrivalled training of the mind) by which a man is likely to set much store when he is past five-and-twenty,' and some useful remarks as to the choice of the literature of the subject. For general purposes it is worth noting that this collection contains *inter alia* the following vases of interest: nos. 23, 24. Two unpublished Panathenaic amphoræ. 50. Krater r. f. with Kaineus in Centauro-machia. 52. Kylix r. f. with seven Theseus scenes in interior and four repeated on exterior. 53. Kylix r. f. with exterior and interior in style of Epiktetos: 'Αἰσ[ια] καλός. 55. Amphora r. f. Satyrs holding armour, style of Duris. 56. Oinochoe, r. f. boy with hoop and stick, style of Hieron.—CECIL SMITH.

BRITISH MUSEUM.—The conversion of the old Print Room into a gallery of sepulchral monuments announced in the June number of this *Review* (p. 176) has progressed so far that the gallery is now open to the public. When the temporary floor has been replaced later on by a permanent floor about six feet lower down, the reliefs which have been built into their permanent places in the walls will be seen from a more satisfactory point of view, and the smaller reliefs which are now ranged in rows in the centre of the room will be placed round the walls below

these. Some large sarcophagi will then be placed along the centre.—C. T.

In the *Jahrbuch* 1887 p. 145, Studniczka is inclined to suppose from his reading of an artist's name Πησιδῆς or Μησιδῆς that the same name is traceable on the alabastron from Cyprus recently acquired by the British Museum (see *Classical Review* 1887, p. 26). I have already pointed out that there are good reasons for reading Πησιδῆς and no more. The vase in question will be published in colours in the forthcoming number of the *Hellenic Journal* by Mr. Murray, who agrees entirely with me on this point.—C. S.

Jahrbuch des k. deutschen Arch. Inst. 1887: part 3. Berlin.

1. Conze: bronze statuette of Hermes, in possession of Herr v. Radowitz: in left hand has been kerykeion, in right is a ram's horn and ear: markings in silver: plate and cut. 2. Studniczka: (a very important article): (i.) restores statue by Antenor on the base inscribed with his name: the Naples group of the Tyrranicides must be referred to Antenor, not, as was supposed, to Kritios and Nesiotes: the Nearchos here noted is not the potter of that name, although traces of dedications of their wares by known vase-artists have been found. (ii., iii.) The early history of painting as given by Pliny is actually borne out by evidence of vases, if we assign (iv.) the commencement of r.f. painting to the time of the Peisistratids: a conclusion confirmed by references on vases to individuals of that period: one plate, eleven cuts. 3. Dümmler: an Attic lekythos from Cyprus: between the revolt of Onesilos and B.C. 449 no Attic importations to Cyprus were possible; so that the r.f. vases found there must be referred to the sixth century. Probably the introduction of the r.f. style is contemporary with an early stage of b.f. painting. Relation of vase-painting to Polygnotos: denies strong influence of Parthenon sculptures on vase painting: plate. 4. Robert: bronze statuette of akottabos-manes in Berlin Museum: cut. 5. Sittl: the Hesiodic shield of Herakles; the descriptions are not merely poetic fancies, but correspond with the art and technique of the beginning of the seventh century, at which time we may imagine a similar actual shield to have existed: it points strongly to a Boeotian, perhaps Theban, original. 6. Belger: note on the bronze statue of a boxer recently found in Rome. 7. Morgenthau: a vase described in *Bullet.* 1873, p. 169, and now in Metropolitan Museum of New York: the so-called Myronic group is only the group of a Satyr and Mænad, a mere reminiscence, like many others, of the famous sculpture: cut.

Acquisitions of British and Berlin Museums 1886, with cuts of latter. Bibliography.—C. S.

Römische Mittheilungen. 1887: part 3. Rome.

1. Helbig: this year's excavations at Corneto. 2. Hartwig: marble head of Helios which has had bronze rays, found in Rhodes in 1857: and a similar head in terra-cotta; from a comparison with coins of Lampsaacus and Megiste, and with late types, this seems to represent the school of Lysippos and is probably from a group such as Lysippos made of Helios in his chariot; two plates, three cuts. 3. The same: Attic r.f. cups in Rome with names of artists and their favourites. 4. Dümmler: a class of black-figured vases with peculiar design and ornamentation, hitherto wrongly called Etruscan; and their bearing on early representations of Seythians in Greek art: two plates, two cuts.

5. Stettiner: the inferior weight of the Etruscan *as* is not due to the late adoption of the *as grave* into Etruria, but is a reduction from a primitive series previously existing there. 6. Lignana: Faliscan inscriptions. 7. Barnabei: an interesting inscription found on the Via Ostiense, recording a decree of July 25th, 227 A.D. in answer to a request of one Geminus Eutychetes to the Quinquennales that he might erect a small monument (*memoriola*) in the *horti olitorii*: with reference probably to a collegium magnum of slaves and freedmen of the imperial household. 8. Mau: the term '*pergula*', used frequently to express the place where objects are exposed for sale, is explained in the buildings of Pompeii.—C. S.

Revue Archéologique. July—August. 1887. Paris.

1. Berger: the basalt sarcophagus of Tabnith, recently found by Hamdy Bey at Saïda, with transcription of the very important Phœnician inscription by Ernest Renan: Tabnith was the father of the Eshmunazar, whose sarcophagus was discovered in 1855. The form is anthropoid, and the inscriptions are in hieroglyphics and Phœnician characters. The date is probably about the beginning of the third century B.C.: two plates. 2. Vernaz: Notes on 'Excavations at Carthage, 1884—5': plate. 3. Vercoutre: the necropolis of Sfax and the custom of burial in jars: the jars are broken or sawn in two, the body, sometimes *nude*, inserted, and the parts of one or more jars are then rejoined: the whole is then laid horizontally, and covered with a roof of large tiles; the gable ends thus formed are also blocked with tiles: three cuts. 4. Bazin: the amphitheatre of Lugdunum; a letter preserved in Eusebius from the Christians in Lyons to their brethren in Asia, describes certain martyrdoms in the amphitheatre there, which seems to have been discovered by M. Lafon. 5. Deloche: signet rings of the Merovingian period: continued. 6. Homolle: the Iomilcas mentioned in the Delian lists is the same as the Carthaginian ambassador honoured in an Athenian decree (Hicks' *Manual*, 142). 7. Prost: Christian sarcophagi of Gaul: continued. 8. Néroutos-Bey: Greek inscriptions from Alexandria: continued.

Salomon Reinach's *Chronique d'Orient*: forty pages full of interesting news from all parts of the ancient world; we may note a long letter (p. 76), in which Mr. Stillman returns to the attack on Tiryus. Hamdy Bey brings (p. 118) important testimony to bear on the falsity of the so-called 'Asia Minor' terra-cottas. Letters from Néroutos-Bey on a Græco-Byzantine inscription, and on four inscriptions recently found at Ramleh.

Reviews: G. Humbert, 'Essai sur les finances et la comptabilité publique chez les Romains.' Studniczka, 'Beiträge zur Geschichte der altgr. Tracht.' Pais, 'Straboniana.' Marquardt und Mommsen, 'Manuel des Antiquités Romaines': traduction, Vol I.—C. S.

Bullettino della Commissione Archeologica Comunale di Roma. 1887. Rome.

PART 9. (I.) Visconti describes an interesting marble relief, recently discovered in the Villa Ludovisi: it occupies the three faces of a rectangular framework, which may have served to protect some aperture. On the front is a female, only half seen, rising apparently out of water, assisted by an attendant on each side, who hold the ends of a veil which passes in front of the central figure. On one side-piece is a nude female with legs crossed, leaning back and playing on the

double flutes. On the other, a female, closely draped, sits holding a lamp, which she is about to place on a candelabrum beside her. Visconti thinks it may have reference to a *lustratio* in the lesser Eleusinia; and that it is an archaistic work of early Imperial times. It is to be placed in the museum of the Villa Ludovisi; two plates. (II.) Gatti notes recent discoveries bearing on topography and epigraphy, including three tombs of the oldest necropolis, containing vases of the so-called Latial bucchero, bronze fibulae, and bronze rings: and near the Via Genova, a quantity of bronze and other objects of the first century A.D. (III.) De Rossi and Gatti continue the publication of inscribed collars of slaves.—C. S.

American Journal of Archaeology, 1887, vol. iii. nos. 1, 2.

1. Waldstein: restates Bernoulli's opinion that the Louvre Venus Genetrix is a replica from the work of Arkesilaos: and Lenormant's attribution of the Esquiline Venus to the school of Pasiteles. Plate. 2. Fowler: Thrasymedes, who made the statue of Asklepios at Epidauros, is probably as late as the end of the fourth century, and the Melian terra-cotta reliefs used by Brunn as evidence of an earlier date probably have no connection with the throne-reliefs of that statue. 4. Wheeler republishes and comments on the Attic decree concerning the 'Sanctuary of Kodros' (Εφμερίς, 1884, p. 161). Two plates. 6. Frothingham: a proto-Ionic capital on an Oriental cylinder, and bird worship. Plate.

Reviews.—(i.) Numismatics: Coin Catalogues of British Museum; Garrucci, 'Le Monete dell' Italia antica'; Imhoof-Blumer's 'Porträtköpfe auf antiker Münzen'; Six 'De Gorgone'; Imhoof-Blumer and P. Gardner, 'Numismatic Commentary on Pausanias'; and nine Russian publications on the coinages of the Kimmerian Bosphoros; Friedländer and Weil, 'Repertorium zur antiker Numismatik'; Head, 'Historia Numorum'; Soutzo, 'Étalons pondéraux primitifs'; Cohen, 'Description des monnaies frappées sous l'empire Romain'; Boutowski, 'Dictionnaire Numismatique'; Schlumberger, 'Œuvres de A. de Longperier'; Lépaule, 'Édit de Maximin'.

Menant, 'The French expedition to Susiana.' Two plates. Letters from Tripoli, Olympia, Sidon.

Reviews.—(ii.) Petrie's 'Naukratis'; Reber's 'History of Mediaeval Art,' Translated by J. T. Clarke, Fenger 'Dorische Polychromie'; De Rossi's Introduction to vol. i. of the Catalogue of the Palatine MSS.; and his 'Basilica di S. Stefano Rotondo.'

Archaeological News, Summary of Recent Discoveries and Investigations. Summaries of Periodicals.

Plate x. omitted from vol. ii. is here given.—C. S.

Museo Italiano di Antichità Classica, vol. ii. pt. 2. Florence.

1. Sabbadini: Latin codices possessed, discovered, and illustrated by Guarino Veronese. 2. Pistelli: On the MSS. of Iamblichus, and a new edition of the *Protreptikos*. 3. Tomassetti: Sylloge of 'Latial' inscriptions. 4. Piccolomini: The simulated madness of Solon, and the elegy *Σαλαμὶς*. 5. Halbherr: The recent excavations at Gortyna; four plates. 6. Comparetti: Archaic inscriptions of Gortyna recently found in excavations near the Letheum. 7. The same: Inscriptions from various Cretan cities.

C. S.

Revue Numismatique, 3rd. ser. vol. v. 3rd. trimestre, 1887. H. B. Earle Fox, 'The Athenian Obol and its divisions at the Macedonian epoch.—E. Babelon, 'A tetradrachm of Eretria.' A rare coin in the French Collection. M. Babelon reads on it the name of an engraver ΦΑ.—Th. Reinach, 'Essay on the numismatics of the kings of Bithynia.' The first instalment of an elaborate study of this series, accompanied by plates.—E. Lépaule, 'Mariniana and Saloninus.' It is suggested that Mariniana, who is known only from coins, was the first wife of Gallienus and the mother of the Marinianus whose name appears on a medallion of Gallienus. The date A. D. 258 usually assigned for the death of Saloninus is discussed, and A. D. 266 proposed as preferable.

Reviews. R. Mowat's 'Explication d'une marque monétaire du temps de Constantin,' by P. Charles Robert.

Zeitschrift für Numismatik. Berlin. vol. xv. part I. 1887. A. Von Sallet.—'Acquisitions of the Royal Coin-Cabinet from April 1, 1886 to April 1, 1887.—Of the 426 coins acquired, 159 are Greek and 24 Roman.—A. Löbbecke, 'Greek Coins from my Collection.' Part III.—W. Drexler, 'On some Coins published by Sabatier in the *Revue de la Numismatique belge*.' Corrects errors in Sabatier's descriptions.

Annuaire de la Société française de Numismatique. July—August, 1887. A. de Belfort, 'Roman Imperial Coins not described in Cohen's Work.' The descriptions of these new coins fill 20 pp. of the article.—A. Chaugarnier, 'The Drachms of the Pictavi.' Gives a list of coins which may be attributed to the Pictavi, chiefly from the evidence of the find-spots of the specimens.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

Athenæum.—17 Sept. contains a review of P. Gardner's Catalogue of Greek coins; Peloponnesus (excluding Corinth). 15 Oct. notices of R. Ellis' *Fables of Ævianus*, and Haskins' *Lucan's Pharsalia* (the introduction by Mr. Heitland is very highly praised).

Academy.—1 Oct. letter from H. Nettleship, complaining of Reitzenstein's treatment of his essays on *Verrinus Flaccus*. 8 Oct. review by R. Ellis, of Hildebrandt's studies in Vergil's *Culex* (the author maintains that ninety-six verses are by Vergil, and that the remaining 318 are spurious additions). 15 Oct. E. Sibree holds that *ἀδω* (Hom. *Od.* 19, 229) = *fremere*. The Nos. from 17 Sept. to 15 Oct. contain a discussion by E. P. L. Brock, W. T. Watkin and others, on the age of walls of Chester, and a dozen inscriptions on tombstones are communicated by W. T. Watkin. In the 1 Oct. and following Nos. an inscription on a Roman patera found at South Shields is discussed by R. Blair and J. H. Abrahall.

The October No. of *Macmillan's Magazine* has an article on Homer the Botanist; and the *Fortnightly Review* an article by A. Lang on Byways of Greek Song.

Archiv für lateinische Lexicographie, iv. 2:—(Pp. 169-188) *Genuswechsel der Deminutiva* (A. Weinhold). After considering the diminutive suffixes, generally in agreement with Osthoff, Weinhold discusses what he thinks 'diminutives falsely so called,' i.e. words in *-ulus, -ulum, -ulum, &c.* Then (p. 180) he divides the dim. with altered gender into (1) words preserving an older gender, (2) where the meaning changes markedly (3) where the sense demands a particular gender (*Corculus, &c.*), (4) examples from late Latin where no reason for the change of gender is visible. The paper has no index, and some details are treated scantily.—(pp. 189-196) *Das Pflanzenreich im Sprichwort* (A. Otto)—(p. 196) *Isid. Or.* 17. 3. 10 (Schwarz) read 'hexastichum.'—(pp. 197-222) *Die Verba frequentativa und intensiva* (E. Wölflin). In six sections: (1) the frequentatives are formed from the perf. pass. part. or by analogy. In some cases one can trace old participles thus **gerus*, whence *vero* by the side of *recto vectus*. (2) Frequentative verbs are used in ante- and post-classical literature, avoided by Terence, Cicero, Caesar, and

Livy (except in first decade). (3) Frequentative and intensive verbs are the same. (4) and (5) Meaning of the suffix: *captare* = 'geschickt u. öfter greifen,' not 'greifen wollen.' (6) Frequentative verbs lost their special sense by 300 A.D. Two main causes were (a) use of freq. verbs to supply missing forms, and (b) use *metri gratia* in poets—(pp. 223-245) *Die Verba auf-illare* (A. Funck). Continued from p. 87. The chief verbs considered are *ocillo, sorbillo, sugillo, focillo, obstringillo, vacillo*. No conclusion is reached about *sugillo*.—(p. 246) *Expedire* (L. Havet)—(pp. 247-258) *Uls, trans, ultra* (Ph. Thielmann). First part of a lexicographical article—(p. 258) *Lausa* (Schöll). In *Trucul.* 730 for MSS. *lausum* read *lausam* (*Archiv.* ii. 605: iii. 510)—(pp. 259-276) *Ueber die Latinität der 'Peregrinatio ad loca sancta'* (E. W.). The article is full of most interesting detail about the Latin of 400 A.D.—(pp. 277-287) Lexicographical articles on *Abhorreo, abhorresco, abhorride*, by H. Ploen—(pp. 288-315) Thirty-six lexicographical articles *abi*—to *abl*—, by E. W.—(p. 315) *Interemo, peremo* (K. E. Georges)—(pp. 316-324) *Miscellen: Komposita auf -fer und -ger* (Stolz), *verba auf-izare, &c.* (Funck) *In privativum (haud inipigre)* by Vogel, &c.—(pp. 325-343) *Reviews: p. 342 of Mowat's Alphida.*

Neue Jahrbücher f. Philologie und Pädagogik, ed. Fleckeisen u. Masius, iii. and iv. parts (Leipzig, Teubner) contain the following articles:—(1) *Zur Odyssee*, by A. Scotland (continued), notes on φ and γ. (2) *Zu Theognis*, 1015, by J. Sitzler, chiefly on the transitive use of πῆξαι. (3) *Technologisches zu Soph. Aias*, 651, by R. Paehler, defending the suggestion βαῦν for βαφῆ. (4) *Zur Kritik der Griech. Tragiker*, by H. Stadtmüller, proposing in *Æsch. Cho.* 515 either κοιμῶσ' ἀνέκαστον πάθος or τέμνοισ' ἀνέκαστον ἄκος: *Æsch. Supp.* 456 ἀκούσά: καὶ λέγοις ἄν: *Æsch. Cho.* 273 τοῦ πατρὸς μαιφόνους: *Soph. Trach.* 528 ἐλαινὸν ἀμβλέπει: *Soph. Phil.* 258 γελῶσιν ἐγγλόντες or γελῶσ' ἄγαν χλόντες: *Soph. El.* 28 ἐν πρώτοις πρέπει: *Soph. O.C.* 1336 ὀκνοῦμεν, and in 861 δεινὸν λέγει: τοῦτ' αὐτὸ νῦν πεπράξεται: *Eur. Med.* 649 μοῖραν ἁμὲν ξανόσασα: *Eur. Iph. Aul.* 671 ἐπιτὼν χρῆ τοῖα μὴ εἰδέναι κόρας and 418 εἰς τε τέρψιν εἰ σφ' ἰδῶν. (5) *Zum Hom. Hermes hymnos* 234, by R. Peppmüller, rejecting the whole line. (6) *Zu Epicharmos*, by E. Hiller, a discussion of the saying αἷτα φόνος ἀνθρώπων, ἄσκολ πεφουσημένοι attributed to Ep. by Clemens Al. *Strom.* iv. 45, and other

writers. (7) *Der Idealstaat des Antisthenes*, by F. Susemihl, a discussion of the tenth volume of Antisthenes as described by Diog. Laert. vi. 18. (8) *Ein neu entdeckter Codex des Aristoteles*, by G. Konstantinides, describing very briefly a MS. of *περί οὐρανοῦ*, *περί γεν. καὶ φθορ.* and *περί ψυχῆς* lately discovered in Philippopolis. (9) *Skylla in der Aristot. Poetik und der Jüngere Dithyrambos*, by F. Susemihl, an answer to Gomperz's critique, which, with Susemihl's first article, is in the *Jahrb.* for 1886. (10) *Zu Diog. Laertios*, by F. Hultsch, three little criticisms on the life of Arkesilaos, in iv. 39-43. (11) On *ἐπὶ πόλεω* and *ἐπὶ δυνάμει*, by K. P. Schulze, concluding that the former is the usual form in prose, but the latter is frequent in Plato. (12) On Delbrück's *Die Perserkriege und die Burgunderkriege* (Berlin, 1887), a notice by L. Reinhardt, giving the chief points without criticism. (13) *Zum Hom. Hermeshymnos*, by A. Ludwig, reading 224 *ἄποιμαί εἶναι* and proposing, 225, *ὄφρις*, with some other MSS. (14) *Ad Plutarchi de Proverbiis Alexandrinorum Libellum nuper repertum*, by O. Crusius, an account of emendations admitted by the writer in his recent edition (Leipzig, Teubner). (15) *Zu Cic. Verr.* iv. 128, by H. Kothe, proposing for *parinum caput* either *pari num* [*inis contemplatione*] *caput* or *pari vi num* (the subsequent *num* being merely conjectural). (16) *Emendationes Vergilianae*, by E. Bachrens, a long series of conjectures to *Aen.* iii. of which we may cite 33 *liquitur* (cf. for the quantity *Lucr.* iv. 1259), 411 *parascens*, 448 *centos*, 454 *et tua cursus*, 484 *ne cedat honore*, 605 *frustus* (cf. *Naevius.* i. p. 525), 670 *adtreclare*, 674 *Sicaniæ*, 683 *sequendis*. (17) *Zu Cic. de Orat.* ii. 240, by O. Harnecker, explaining the letters LLLMM as an electioneering placard, *Leges Laetus Lubens Merito Memmianum*. (18) *Zu Juvenalis Satiren*, by A. Weidner, another long series of conjectures, of which only a few can conveniently be cited, as X. 295 *osque suum*, X. 191 *et aniles* (previously suggested by N. Heinsius), viii. 241 *quantum unda Lencade*, v. 141 *sua nunc Mycale*, iii. 104 *ad omnia for et omni* (cf. *Lucr.* i. 1106, acc. to Lachmann) xii. 23 *qualia*.

Philologus, vol. xlv, part 2 contains:—

I. *Abhandlungen.*

9. P. W. Forchhammer, *Mythologie eine wissenschaft.* "A myth represents by a series of double entendres (*γλῶτται*, *διπλὰ ὀνόματα*, *μεταφοραί*, ref. to Plato and Arist.) a set of natural phenomena as violations of the supernatural." Treatment exemplified. —10. R. Hildebrandt, *Ἀθήνη Γλαυκῶπις*. "The goddess of the clear-grey sea, from *γλαυκ* still-bright rather than sparkling and *ωπ*-water." Other derivatives of each *γ*. —11. R. Unger, *Bemerkungen zu Hygini Fabulae*. Chiefly critical. —12. Richardus Foerster, *De Adamantii Physiognomonice recensendis*. —13. E. Schweder, *Ueber die gemeinsame quelle der geographischen darstellungen des Mela und des Plinius*. "Each, as well as Strabo, had access to an official *χωρογραφία*, companion to the famous map." —14. G. F. Unger, *Die römischen kalenderdaten aus 218-15 v. Ch.* Against the system and the conclusions of Matzat (*Römische Chronologie* I, II, and *Zeittafeln*).

II. *Jahresberichte.*

47. H. F. Müller, *Plotinos* (continued from xxxix. 1). The fresh publications on the author enumerated and reviewed.

III. *Miscellen.*

A. *Mittheilungen aus handschriften.* 7. Xaver Kreuttner, *Handschriftliches zu dem lexikon des Ammonius*. On MS no. 2652 Paris.

B. *Zur erklärungs und Kritik der schriftsteller.*

1. Fr. Susemihl, *Zu Platons Theaetetos*, (155 B) omits *μήτε αὐξηθέντα... ἐναντιῶ*. (182 B) reads *ἀμφοτέρων ἀμφοτέρα*. (192 A-D) inserts *καὶ δ' οἷδε καὶ αἰσθάνεται*, *δ' μὴ οἷδε μὴδ' αἰσθάνεται* in B, after *κατὰ ταῦτά, δ' αἰσθάνεται*, and *καὶ δ' μὴ οἷδε μὴδ' αἰσθάνεται*, *δ' οἷδε καὶ αἰσθάνεται* in C, after *δ' μὴ αἰσθάνεται*. (195 A) with H. Schmidt, strikes out *ἢ ἐπινοῶσιν* and *καὶ παρανοοῦσι*. —9. L. Tachau, *Zu Senecas tragödien.* 1. *Herc. Oet.* 134-172 is not by Seneca but a cento. —10. M. Erdmann, *Zu Cornelius Nepos*. Defending him as an author for schoolboys, with cautions for his use. —21. M. Petschenig, *Zu Seneca de vita beata*. 12. 5. 'adlubescentiae' for 'adulesc.' 13. 2. 'et iam induit' for 'set iam inde.' C. *Auszüge aus Schriften*, &c.

Notes:—Th. Stangl, *Zu Ciceros Briefen*. Read 'Haec nimirum...' for 'Haec mihi...' (*ad Brut.* i. 17, 4). —A. Eussner, *Zu Fulgentius*, xiv. l. 23 (Keiffersch.). 'Augustis' for 'angustiis.' —Rob. Petersen, *Zu L. Seneca (De Clem. i. 5.5.)*: 'infractam' for 'infra terram.' —M. Petschenig, *Zu Seneca dem philosophen (De provid. 4. 3.)*: 'conatum' for 'una vim'; (*De const. sap. 6. 3.*) 'sed sic procedit... quasi dicat' (4-4) 'et se quoque' (8. 3.) 'domini minitanti' (18. 1.) 'forebatur [in] omnis.'

Rheinisches Museum, vol. xlii. part 3, contains:—

E. Hiller, *Beiträge zur griechischen Litteraturgeschichte*, V. *Homer als Collectionenname*. 'That Homer was ever held by common opinion in antiquity to be the author of the epic cycle is erroneous, and due to the deceptions of rhapsodists, &c. with misapprehension of the loci.' —A. Otto, *Zur Kritik von Statius' Silvae*. Notes and emendations in Bk. i. —P. Natorp, *Nochmals Diogenes und Leukippos*. Replying to Diels' attack xlii. 1. —O. Crusius, *Ueber die Sprichwörterammlung des Maximinus Planudes*. On the MSS, history, and editions of the work, with the most interesting passages quoted and illustrated. —G. Thourout, *Die Chronologie von 218-17 v. Chr.* Against the date fixed for Trebia by Matzat in the *Zeittafeln*. —J. Ilberg, *Zur Ueberlieferung des Hippokratischen Corpus*. Classifying the MSS. —C. Wachsmuth, *Zur Topographie von Alexandria*. Deductions from a passage quoted from a monk by Theodorus, Bishop of Paphos. —*Herodicea*, scripsit J. Schönemann 'Ar. Ran. 1028. Read *Μαρόνιου* for *Δαπέλου*: reference to second edition of *Persae*, acted at Syracuse; see *Schol.*'

Miscellen:—

Coniectanea, scripsit F. B. —I. Defends his reading 'suum' in *Juv.* x. 294. II. Punctuates 'ille sui, palpo quem' in *Pers.* v. 175, and refers the *Floralia* mentioned, not to the Roman festival but of c. i. l. ix. 3947. III. *Lucil. fr.* 103 *Bähr*. Reads 'si dent for 'student'; *Id. fr.* 585 'arguta manu' for 'argutimini.' IV. *Julius Romanus ap. Charis.* p. 145, 29. Reads 'torces' for 'tores,' and for Pomponianus cf. c. i. l. viii. 2391. —A. Ludwig, *Zur Aeschylus Eumeniden*, l. 76: read *κέν... βαβῶς ἀμείψης*. —E. Rohde, *Die Zeit des Pittacus*: a comment on Susemihl's paper, xlii. p. 141. —K. Schöll, *Inscript von Knidos*, 'Newton, Disc. Halicarn.', &c. i. pl. xcii. No. 40; II. p. 755: read *ἀθανάτοις θυόεντα* | *δαμιοῦργος* 'Ἀποκράς | ἰδρύσατο Βωμόν.' —E. Hoffman; *Epcur (Gerhard Etr. Spiegel*, III Pl. 181; IV 3352): derives from 'Epeios of Elia. —K. Zangemeister, *Zu Velleius*, I. (i. 17, 35) 'procedentis in unum saeculum' II. (ii. 109, 51): for 'Corpus suum custodientium' read 'corona saltum custoditum.' —E. Wölfflin, *Zu Suetons Pratum*. —J. Cholodniak, *Prosepnais oder Prosepnai*: 'On the Speculum Cosanum, the older reading Prosepnai is the true one' (from actual inspection). —M. Ihne, *Neue Inschriften*

aus Köln und Mainz—I. A votive tablet to the Quadriviae; II. A tomb inscr. (fragmentary); III. A dedication (also fragmentary).

Philologische Rundschau, Bremen, 1887:—

No. 1 (8 Jan.)—W. Christ, *Platonische Studien*, Abhandlungen der Königl. bayer. Akad. i. kl. xvii. Bd. ii. Abt. (Nusser): an interesting and valuable contribution towards determining the chronology and mutual relations of the dialogues.—Heraeus, *Quaestiones criticae et palaeographicae de codd. Livianis* (Lutcherbach): deserves to be extended into a regular and much-needed treatise on Latin palaeography.—Riemann, *Études sur la langue de Tite Live* (Schmalz): one of the most valuable monographs on Latin style and syntax.

No. 3 (5 Feb.)—Fick, *Die Homerische Ilias in der ursprünglichen Sprachform* (Sittl). The attempt to Aeolize Homer is open to objections: (1) the late date of the Aeolic colonies; (2) the impossibility of removing all non-aeolic forms; (3) the marked difference between the laws of the Homeric and Aeolic digamma.—Brugmann, *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen* (Stolz): sums up in a clear and attractive form the results arrived at in Comparative Grammar since the appearance of the fourth edition of Schleicher's work in 1876.

No. 4 (19 Feb.)—Schubert, *Sophoclis Trachiniae* (Müller): the editor gives a new collation of the Laurentian, and of Paris A, which he regards as the chief of an independent family; the work shows a thorough acquaintance with Sophoclean literature.—Baunach, *Studien auf dem gebiete des griechischen und der arischen Sprachen* (Stolz): a discussion of the Gortynian inscription, followed by a publication of various inscriptions chiefly from the Asclepion at Epidaurus.

No. 5 (5 March)—Pfitzner, *Taciti Annales*, xi-xvi. (Wolff): the editor's chief endeavour has been to follow the line of thought; his grammatical, historical and antiquarian notes are perhaps even too short; in his criticism of the text he is thoroughly conservative.—Friedländer, *Martialis Epigrammata* (Zingerle): a new collation of the MSS. has done much to further the criticism of the text, while the explanatory notes are masterly.—Dahl, *Zur Handschriftenkunde des ciceronischen Cato Maior* (Degenhart): a fuller account of Leiden V, published by Gemoll, and of Paris P, with readings from thirty-eight other MSS. at Paris, and eight at Leiden.—Zacher, *Zur griechischer Nominalcomposition*, *Breslauer philologische Abhandlungen*, i. Band, i. Hft 1886 (Stolz): a valuable contribution.

No. 6 (19 March)—Meister, *Quintiliani Institutio Oratoria*, vol. i. (Kiderlin): a great advance on previous editions.—Hermann von der Pforten, *Zur Geschichte der griechischer Denominativen* (Stolz): fills a gap.—Engelbrecht, *über die Sprache des Claudianus Mamertus* (Mohr): points out the influence of Apuleius or Claudianus Mamertus and other Gallic writers of the fifth century.

No. 7 (2 April)—Ritterling, *de legione x. gemina* (Pfitzner): the success of this first work should lead the writer to attempt a general history of the legions.—Menger, *Einführung in die antike Kunst*, second edition (Neuling): improved by the addition of new matter and photographs, but lessened in value as a school book by the introduction of Asiatic art, and a number of minute details.

No. 8 (16 April)—Owen, *Ovid, Tristia*, Book i. (Gustafsson): the recension of the text based on an independent collation of the MSS. is carried out on sound and conservative principles; the introduction

gives a satisfactory account of the life and literary history of the poet.—Menrad, *de contractionis et synizesos usu Homericis* (Kammer): a work of much pains and learning; the author tries to show that in the original poem contraction was used only (1) in the last foot, (2) in the chief caesura, (3) where several short vowels occur close together.—Zvetaieff, *Inscriptiones Italiae inferioris* (Pauli): the inscriptions are not always accurately reproduced, and the interpretations are often one-sided.—Wattenbach, *Anleitung zur lateinischer palaeographie*, fourth edition (Ruess): considerably enlarged to embrace the results of palaeographical studies in the last ten years.

No. 9 (30 April)—Rettig, *Xenophontis Symposium* (Bullinger): a restoration of the work to its proper place.—Meister, *Quintiliani Institutio Oratoria*, vol. ii. (Kiderlin): possesses the same merits as vol. i. criticized in vi.—Simon, *on the Gortynian Inscription* (Rettig): the work is not without value in spite of printers' and other errors.—Johansson, *de derivatis verbis contractis linguae graecae* (Stolz): a useful contribution.

Zeitschrift für das Gymnasialwesen—The July-August number contains nothing of interest for readers of this Review, unless it be a most elaborate criticism of the 30th edition of Ellendt's School Latin Grammar, revised by Seyffert. In the September number there is a long review of a book by Knoke upon Germanicus's campaigns in Germany. Knoke claims to have settled all the localities. But his critic has little difficulty in convicting him of blunders and of a want of logic almost equal to the presumption with which he asserts his infallibility. The chief interest in the criticism seems to be a personal one.

Revue Critique, 1887.—Besides reviews each part gives a chronicle, summaries of periodicals, and proceedings of the Acad. des Inscriptions and the Soc. Nat. des Antiquités de France. (3 Jan.) Koestlin's ed. of 'Schwegler's Greek Philosophy'; Selections from 'Plato,' by Purves and Jowett; Campbell's 'Theaetetus'; C. Waddington, 'On the authenticity of the Platonic writings'; Hesselmeier, 'On the origin of the city of Pergamos'; H. Paul, 'Principles of Linguistic.' (10 Jan.) 'Silvestre de Sacy,' by M. H. Derembourg. (17 Jan.) 'Éléments de Gram. Grecque,' by Roersch and Thomas; Horace 'Ars Poetica,' with notes by M. Albert. (24 Jan.) Dionysii Thracis 'Ars Grammatica,' by Uhlig; 'Les Sarcophages Chrétiens de la Gaule,' by Le Blanc; P. Janet, 'Histoire de la Science Politique.' (7 Feb.) 'Brugmann's Comparative Grammar,' vol. i.; Löwy 'Inchriften griech. Bildhauer.' (14 Feb.) Duruy, 'Histoire des Grecs,' vol. i.; Wex, 'Métrologie grecque et romaine,' tr. by P. Monet. (21 Feb.) Holder's 'Herodotus,' vol. i.; Poirer, 'Essai sur l'éloquence judiciaire à Rome'; De Rossi, 'Il monastero di S. Erasmo.' (28 Feb.) Collignon, 'Phidias'; Robert Ellis, 'Sources of the Etruscan and Basque languages'; Fierville, 'Une grammaire latine inédite du treizième siècle.' (14 March) Barclay Head, 'Historia Numorum'; Henzey, 'Les opérations militaires de J. César étudiées sur le terrain'; Vernes, 'Une nouvelle hypothèse sur la composition et l'origine de Deutéronome.' (21 March) Egger, 'Histoire de la critique chez les grecs,' ed. 2; De Ruggiero, 'Dizionario epigraphico di Antichità romana.' (28 March) Loeschke, 'Boreas u. Oreithya am Kypseloskasten.' (4 April) Engel, 'die Aussprache des Griechischen'; Wehrich, 'Speculum quod fertur S. Augustini'; Vernes, 'Histoire des religions.' (11 April) Bazin, 'l'Aphrodite Marseillaise du Musée de Lyons'; Darnesteter, 'La vie des Mots';

Wheeler, 'Der griechische Nominal-accent.' (18 Apr.) Vischer, 'L'Apocalypse de Saint Jean; Droysen, 'Hist. de l'Hellénisme,' tr. by Bouché-Leclercq; Omont, 'Catalogue des MSS. grecs des bibliothèques de Suisse.' (25 April) Rouire, 'La découverte du bassin hydrographique de la Tunisie centrale, etc.'; Hauvette, 'Les Stratèges Athéniens'; Aubé, 'L'Église et l'État dans la seconde moitié du troisième siècle.' (2 May) Buchholz, 'Vindiciae Carminum Homerorum,' vol. i.; Upcott, 'Introduction to Greek Sculpture'; E. Merimée, 'De antiquis aquarum religionibus in Gallia Meridionali'; 'Gazette Archéologique,' 1886; L. G. Pellissier, 'Les amis d'Holstenius,' vol. ii.: Notice of Prize offered by the University of Göttingen for the best edition of the remains of the Greek Stoic philosophers, to be sent in by Aug. 31, 1889. (9 May) Hauvette, 'De archonte rege'; Denis, 'La comédie grecque'; De Colleville, 'Hist. abrégée des Empereurs grecs et romains'; P. Allard, 'Hist. des persécutions pendant la première moitié du troisième siècle.' (16 May) Babelon, 'Description historique des monnaies de la République romaine'; Omont, 'Inventaire des manuscrits grecs' (in France, the British Museum, Belgium, Switzerland); 'Inscription funéraire de Galoné; Πήγασος et Πήγνυμ'; 'Apollon Agneus.' (23 May) Oberziner, 'Le culte du soleil chez les anciens Égyptiens'; Miliarakis, 'Géographie politique de l'Argolide et de la Corinthe' (in Greek). (30 May) Schulz, 'Quibus ex fontibus fluxerint Agidis, Cleomenis, Arati vitae Plutarchae'; Mommsen and Marquardt, 'Manuel des Antiquités romaines,' tr. by Humbert; Mommsen, 'Droit publique romain,' by Girard; Omont, 'Catalogue des MSS. grecs' (in Holland). (6 June) A. Croiset, 'Thucydides i. ii. avec un commentaire critique et explicatif.' (13 June) Schwartz, 'Scholia in Euripidem,' vol. i.; Pearson and Strong, 'Satires of Juvenal'; 'La suppression des nasales dans l'écriture cyprote.' (20 June) Regnier, 'De la latinité des sermons de S. Augustine.' (27 June) Reinach, 'Essai dans la numismatique des rois de Cappadoce.' (4 July) Homolle, 'De antiquissimis Dianae simulacris Deliacis, Les archives de l'intendance sacrée à Délos'; Renier, 'Inscriptions romaines de l'Algérie'; Weizsäcker, 'Das apostolische Zeitalter der christlichen kirche.' (11 July) Lange, 'Kleine Schriften,' vol. i. (18 July) Petschenig,

'Corippus.' (25 July) Beloch, 'Der Bevölkerung der griechisch-römischen Welt.' (1 Aug.) Holden, 'Cyropaedia of Xenophon,' i. ii.

Theol. Tijdschrift, xxi. 4. July, 1887.—Dr. W. C. van Manen on Marcion's text of the Epistle to the Galatians. In this article the history of the question is given at some length, and reasons alleged for distrusting the testimony of the Fathers who accuse Marcion of altering the place and text of this epistle; the latter accusation shown to be clearly untrue in ii. 5, where *οὐδέ* must have been omitted by the Catholics, not inserted by Marcion.—Dr. J. van Leeuwen, criticises H. Was's study on Plato's *Symposium* in an article called *Een booze demon*, which the Platonic Eros is according to Was, but not according to van Leeuwen: "it is a sacrilege to attach to the last words of the speech of Socrates even 'een zweem van gemeenheid.'"—Dr. J. Balyon reviews Heinrici's commentary on 2 Cor. "He exhibits great philological as well as theological knowledge; is one of the best modern guides to the interpretation of Paul's epistles; but fails in critical method, and errs in rejecting all conjectural emendation."—xxi. 5. (Sept. 1887)—Continuation of van Manen's articles on Marcion's text of the Epistle to the Galatians. The author collects all the cases in which Marcion is accused of having altered the text, and endeavours to show that in all these Marcion's was the original text; this will involve the omission of many verses (e.g. iii. 5-10, 15-25), and the alteration of many others (e.g. v. 9 *ζυμῶ* to *δολῶ*). The evidence is mainly drawn from the requirements of the context. It is further urged that Marcion can have had no reason for mutilating this epistle, since before his time it was not used as an authoritative document. But if Marcion's text of the epistle was original, then the present form must be a 'Bearbeitung' by a Christian who regretted that the original epistle appeared in many respects to put the 'heretics' in the right, and must have been prior to Irenaeus. In a third article van Manen endeavours to discover other cases of 'Bearbeitung' in this epistle, in which the reading of Marcion is not recorded; and in a fourth gives in Greek what was probably the original text of the epistle.

LIST OF NEW BOOKS.

BOOKS PUBLISHED IN ENGLAND.

Aechylus. Eumenides. With Introduction and Notes, by A. Sidgwick. 2 vols. 16mo. 74. 66 pp. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 3s.
Cæsar. Helvetian War. Adapted for the use of Beginners, by W. Welch, M.A., and C. G. Duffield, M.A. With Notes, Exercises, and Vocabularies. 18mo. xii. 94 pp. London, Macmillan. 1s. 6d.
Cicero. In Q. Cæcilium Divinatio and in C. Verrem, Actio Prima, edited, with Introduction and Notes, by John R. King. 12mo. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 1s. 6d.
Homer. Odyssey. Book I. With Introduction, Notes, and Table of Homeric Poems, by W. W. Merry. 12mo. 44 pp. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 1s. 6d.
King (C. W.). The Gnostics and their Remains. Second Edition. Large 8vo. xxiii. 466 pp. 19 Woodcuts in text, 14 full-page plates. Bibliographical Appendix, by Joseph Jacobs, B.A., and full indices. London, David Nutt. £1 1s.

Tacitus Annals: Book I., edited with Introduction and Notes, for use of Schools and Junior Students, by H. Furneaux. 12mo. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 2s.
Terence. Phormio. With Notes and Introductions, intended for the Higher Forms of Public Schools, by Rev. A. Sloman. 12mo. 176 pp. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 3s.
Testament, the Old, in Greek, according to the Septuagint. Edited, for the Syndics of the University Press, by H. B. Swete, D.D. Vol. I. Genesis—IV. Kings. Crown 8vo. xxviii. 829 pp. Cambridge, University Press. 7s. 6d.
Virgil. Æneid IX., edited, with Introduction and Notes, by A. E. Haigh. 12mo. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 1s. 6d.
Xenophon. Cyropaedia. Books III., IV., V., with Notes, by Rev. Hubert A. Holden. 12mo. 230 pp. Cambridge Warehouse. 5s.

BOOKS PUBLISHED ON THE CONTINENT.

- Aristotelis quae feruntur Oeconomica.* Rec. Frz. Susemihl. 12mo. xxx. 94 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 1 Mk. 50.
- Bojesen-Hoffa.* Kurzgefasstes Handbuch der griechischen Antiquitäten. 2. Aufl. von E. Szanto. 8vo. x. 215 pp. Wien. Gerold. 4 Mk.
- Bürger (K.)* De Lucio Patrensi sive de ratione inter Asinum q. f. Lucianum Apuleique metamorphoses intercedente. 8vo. 59 pp. Leipzig. Fock. 1 Mk. 60.
- Busson (A.)* Lykurgos und die grosse Rhetra. 8vo. 29 pp. Innsbruck. Wagner. 80 Pf.
- Cartault (A.)* Sur l'authenticité des groupes en terre-cuite d'Asie Mineure. 4to. 30 pp. 7 plates. Mâcon.
- Cicero.* De oratore liber I. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt von Remig Stölzle. Band 1. Ausg. A. Kommentar unter dem Text. 8vo. vi. 119 pp. Gotha. F. A. Perthes. 1 Mk. 50. Ausg. B. Text und Kommentar getrennt in 2 Heften. iv. 55 and 66 p. 1 Mk. 50.
- *Laelius de Amicitia.* Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt von C. Meissner. 8vo. iii. 70 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 60 Pf.
- Commentaria in Aristotelem graeca edita consilio et auctoritate academicae litterarum regiae borussicae.* Vol. IV., pars. I., et vol. XVI. Berlin. G. Reimer. 29 Mk.
- IV., 1. Porphyrii isagoge et in Aristotelis categorias commentarium ed. Adf. Busse. lvi. 181 pp. 9 Mk.
- XVI. Joannis Philoponi in Aristotelis physicorum tres libros priores commentaria ed. Hieron. Vitelli. xx., 495 pp. 20 Mk.
- Delbrück (H.)* Die Perserkriege und die Burgunderkriege. Zwei kombinierte kriegsgeschichtliche Studien, nebst einem Anhang über die römische Manipular Taktik. 8vo. (viii. 314 pp.). Berlin. Walther and Apolant. 6 Mk.
- Engelbrecht (A.)* Hephastion von Theben und sein astrologisches Compendium. 8vo. (102 pp.) Wien. Konegen. 2 Mk.
- Hartman (I. I.)* Analecta Xenophontea. 8vo. 405 pp. Lugd. Bat. Van Doesburgh.
- Herodotus.* Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt von I. Sitzler. Buch VIII. Ausg. A. Kommentar unterm Text. 8vo. iv. 108 pp. Gotha. F. A. Perthes. 1 Mk. 30. Ausg. B. Text und Kommentar getrennt in 2 Hftn. (iv. 48 and 59 pp.) 1 Mk. 30. (VII. and VIII. 3 Mk. 30).
- Homer.* Odyssee. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt von F. Weck. Heft. 4. Ausg. A. Kommentar unterm Text. 8vo. iv. 108 pp. Gotha. F. A. Perthes. 1 Mk. 20. Ausg. B. Text und Kommentar getrennt in 2 Heften. (pp. 129-174 und 119-168). 1 Mk. 20. (1-4. 4 Mk. 20).
- Keller (O.)* Thiere des classischen Alterthums in culturgegeschichtlicher Beziehung. Mit 56 Abbildungen. 8vo. ix. 488 pp. Innsbruck. Wagner. 10 Mk. 80.
- Klussmann (M.)* Curarum Tertullianearum particulae III. 8vo. 80 pp. Gotha. F. A. Perthes. 1 Mk.
- Maréchal (E.)* Histoire de la civilisation ancienne: Orient, Grèce, Rome. 12mo. 102 pp. 83 cuts and maps. Paris. Delagrave. 5 frs.
- Nageotte (E.)* Précis de la littérature latine depuis les origines jusqu'au 6^e siècle de notre ère. 12mo. ii., 507 pp. Cuts. Paris. Garnier.
- Nissen (H.)* Griechische und römische Mythologie. 8vo. 45 pp. Nordlingen. Beck. 1 Mk.
- Orationes ex Sallusti, Livi, Curti, Taciti libris selectae.* In usum gymnasiorum ed. P. Vogel. 8vo. iv. 205 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 2 Mk. 40.
- Plato.* Euthyphro. In scholarum usum denuo ed. Mart. Schanz. 8vo. 24 pp. Leipzig. B. Tauchnitz. 40 Pf.
- Sammlung ausgewählter Dialoge mit deutschen Kommentar, veranstaltet von Prof. M. Schanz. Band 1. Euthyphro. 8vo. B. Tauchnitz. 69 pp. 75 Pf.
- Poetae Christiani Minores.* Pars I.: *Paulini Petricordiae carmina* rec. M. Petschenig; *Orientii carmina* rec. K. Ellis; *Paulini Pellaei Eucharisticos* rec. G. Brandes; *Claudii Marii Victoris Alethia et Probae cento* rec. C. Schenkl. 8vo. 640 pp. Vienna. Tempsky. 16 Mk. 40.
- Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum.* Vol. XVI.
- Reisig.* Vorlesungen über lateinische Sprachwissenschaft. Mit den Anmerkungen von Prof. F. Hause. Neu bearbeitet von I. H. Schmalz und Dr. Landgraf. 12mo. Vol. III. 12. 2 Mk. Vol. III. eplt. viii. 893 pp. Berlin. Calvary and Co. 18 Mk.
- Schnatter.* J. Éléments de la langue grecque. 4. cours. Éléments de syntaxe grecque. 2. éd. 12mo. iv. 52 pp. Berlin. Herbig. 75 Pf.
- Sophocles.* Tragödien erklärt von C. Schmelzer. Bd. 6. Philoctet. 8vo. 150 pp. Berlin. Habel. 1 Mk. 80. (1-6. 11 Mk. 40).
- Swoboda (R.)* De Demosthenis quae feruntur prooemiis. 8vo. vi. 103 pp., with one plate. Wien. Konegen. 3 Mk.
- Tacitus.* Annalen. Schulausg. von A. Draeger. Bd. 1. Buch I-IV. 5 Aufl. 8vo. vi. 298 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 2 Mk. 40.
- Teuffel (W. S.)* Lateinische Stilübungen. Aus dem Nachlasse hrsg. von S. Teuffel. 8vo. vii. 139 pp. Freiburg. Mohr. 3 Mk. 60.